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Apr 13, 2022

Dear Dr. Klein,
Thanks for submitting your manuscript for streamlined review at Collabra: Psychology. I have read your paper as well as the previous editorial correspondence, and I think this MS is a great fit for Collabra. I am just requesting a few minor revisions:

1. I would like to see figures of results (similar to Figure 1) for the other two exclusion sets in the main text. Obviously page count is not an issue at Collabra and a figure is a great way to get a quick overview of the results. I don’t think readers should have to go to the OSF page for that.
2. Even though the original paper described the death prime as “subtle,” I agree with the previous reviewer that it is really weird to call it that because it is obviously not subtle. I suggest that when you first describe the manipulation, you say that the original authors called this the “subtle” condition (maybe also say, what was the “non-subtle” condition?) and then call it something more reasonable in the rest of the paper.
3. Super picky, but you write “was comprised of” (p. 7) which is, technically, wrong. It’s either “the study session comprised two separate studies” or “the study session was composed of two separate studies.” Sorry, it’s just one of my pet peeves.

I am marking this as a “revise and resubmit” for technical reasons to do with the editorial interface but really you should think of it as an acceptance contingent on these small revisions. Congratulations on an impressive piece of work and thanks for submitting this to Collabra.

Yoel Inbar
Senior Editor, Social Psychology

**Author Response**
Apr 19, 2022

Dear Dr. Inbar,

We submit a revised version of our manuscript addressing the points raised in your review. I provide the review comments in bold below, with our responses in plain text.

**Dear XXXXX,
Thanks for submitting your manuscript for streamlined review at Collabra: Psychology. I have read your paper as well as the previous editorial correspondence, and I think this MS is a great fit for Collabra. I am just requesting a few minor revisions:**

1. **I would like to see figures of results (similar to Figure 1) for the other two exclusion sets in the main text. Obviously page count is not an issue at Collabra and a figure is a great way to get a quick overview of the results. I don't think readers should have to go to the OSF page for that.**

We have added the figures for the other two exclusion conditions in the main text of the manuscript.

1. **Even though the original paper described the death prime as "subtle," I agree with the previous reviewer that it is really weird to call it that because it is obviously not subtle. I suggest that when you first describe the manipulation, you say that the original authors called this the "subtle" condition (maybe also say, what was the "non-subtle" condition?) and then call it something more reasonable in the rest of the paper.**

We agree that this is a helpful clarification, and we have edited this section (Pages 6-8). It now begins by stating what the conditions were in the original:

“Study 1 of Greenberg et al. (1994) provided evidence that reminders of death induce worldview defense, and that this effect was stronger when the reminders of death were comparatively subtle (i.e., thinking about one’s own death) than when reminders of death were more emotionally salient (i.e., thinking about one’s own death and reflecting on their deepest feelings about dying).”

In addition, we have added clarifications that the “subtle” language was a label in the original study, and we have dropped subsequent references to this being subtle when we are describing our own procedure.

1. **Super picky, but you write "was comprised of" (p. 7) which is, technically, wrong. It's either "the study session comprised two separate studies" or "the study session was composed of two separate studies." Sorry, it's just one of my pet peeves.**

We have corrected this grammatical error.

**I am marking this as a "revise and resubmit" for technical reasons to do with the editorial interface but really you should think of it as an acceptance contingent on these small revisions. Congratulations on an impressive piece of work and thanks for submitting this to Collabra.**

**Yoel Inbar
Senior Editor, Social Psychology**

Many thanks for your thoughtful review of the manuscript and prior reviews.

**Editor Final Decision:** Accept

Apr 19, 2022

Dear Dr. Klein,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “Many Labs 4: Failure to Replicate Mortality Salience Effect With and Without Original Author Involvement”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to my comments. 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.

You will be receiving separate correspondence regarding any production and technical comments, data deposits, as well as publication charges. We work with the Copyright Clearance Center to process any applicable APC charges. Please note that your APC transaction must be completed before your article gets published.

You will have an opportunity to check the page proofs before we publish your article. Thank you again for publishing in Collabra: Psychology.

Sincerely,
Yoel Inbar

For additional information, see ported decision letter and author responses uploaded as separate supplemental material files.