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Nov 10, 2021

Dear Angela R. Dorrough,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration by Collabra: Psychology. I have read the paper myself twice; once before consulting the reviews and once after (as is my normal practice – although in this case the reviews were provided by the reviewers at SPPS). My impression of your manuscript can simply be summed up me saying that SPPS’s loss is Collabra’s gain. This is a fine manuscript – not only does it replicate the work of Zlatev it extends it meaningfully. I am going to call this decision letter a conditional acceptance.

Obviously, the original reviews provide a lot of great suggestions for improving the manuscript (too many to reiterate here). That being said, I want to focus on the issues from the reviews that I think are particularly important to address and an additional issue that I believe should be addressed in the revision. Zlatev’s review has a lot of points that I believe should be addressed. I agree with Zlatev that you should speculate more about the differences that emerged in your studies. Obviously, this will be in the discussion section and should be somewhat tentative, but I believe that you can make some valid points (you do this somewhat already, but I believe more is needed).

The other concerns that I would specifically like you to address relates to the meta-analysis. In some ways, you are implementing an internal meta-analysis (this isn’t exactly an internal meta-analysis, but it sort of is: please see Vosgerau et al. <https://faculty.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Vosgerau-Simonsohn-Nelson-Simmons-2019.pdf>). I think addressing some of the concerns raised in this paper and how they relate to your mini-meta may be appropriate here (I will also explicitly note that this concern was also raised by someone else who has laid eyes on this paper at Collabra).

In your revision, please highlight the changes made (I would appreciate you submitting a version with change tracking enabled as well as a clean version of the manuscript). In your coverletter, please detail your responses to all of the points raised about your manuscript summarizing the changes when they are made and if changes are not made, please justify that decision.

I look forward to receiving your final revision and accepting it for publication in Collabra: Psychology.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at editorialoffice@collabra.org.

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

John Edlund

**Author Response**
Nov 21. 2021

Dear Prof. Edlund:

We were pleased to read that you found the manuscript “***Caring about (COVID-19 related) social issues signals trustworthiness: Direct and conceptual replication of Zlatev (2019)***” by Angela Dorrough, Nathalie Bick, Lukas Bring, Caroline Brockers, Charlotte Butz and Iris Schneider potentially suitable for publication in *Collabra: Psychology*.

Based on the decision letter, we extended the manuscript in the following two ways:

In the discussion section we now speculate more about the differences that emerged in our studies. Specifically, we discuss differences between Study 3 and the other studies concerning the (relative) influence of participant/target agreement on perceived integrity-based and perceived benevolence-based trustworthiness. Furthermore, we address the issue of whether a target’s level of caring might be more predictive of integrity-based trustworthiness vs. benevolence-based trustworthiness under certain conditions.

Second, referring to Vosgerau and colleagues, we argue that we follow best-practice approaches to “internal” meta-analyses and highlight in which aspects we deviate from them. We believe that we can provide informative best estimates for the effects of caring on integrity-based and benevolence-based trustworthiness as well as behavioral trust. If the editorial board is concerned despite our additional explanations, we are willing to remove the mini meta-analyses from the paper.

We think that our manuscript has improved by following your excellent advice and we hope that it is now suitable for publication. As requested we submit a version where we highlighted the changes (in green) as well as a manuscript without these markings. In both versions we added the missing information that has been blinded for review.

Thank you again for handling our manuscript.

Sincerely,

Angela Dorrough, Nathalie Bick, Lukas Bring, Caroline Brockers, Charlotte Butz, & Iris Schneider

**Editor Final Decision: Accept**

Nov 28, 2021

Dear Angela R. Dorrough,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “Caring about (COVID-19 related) social issues signals trustworthiness: Direct and conceptual replication of Zlatev (2019)”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to the concerns that the (original) reviewers and I raised. I am happy to say that your paper is now officially accepted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. Congratulations on this excellent work, I think it will make an important contribution to the literature and I look forward to seeing it published! I hope your experiences with Collabra: Psychology have been positive and that you will continue to consider it as an outlet for your work.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. Our managing editor will contact you in case there are any pre-prodution file related questions. You will have an opportunity to check the page proofs before we publish your article. Thank you again for publishing in Collabra: Psychology.

Sincerely,
John Edlund