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Oct 18, 2022

Thanks for submitting your work to Collabra: Psychology for consideration. I sincerely enjoyed reading this work and I have great respect for the substantive efforts required behind the scenes to lead and champion these team science approaches.

Firstly, I should note my own conflict of interest as Editor, in that I have worked with some of the authors of this paper or contributed towards such collaborative projects they describe. If you ever feel like any decision or comment is unduly influenced by this then please do let me know and I am happy to stand aside and arrange a change in Editor. Secondly, there are also potential conflicts of interest with our reviewers who have themselves led a number of collaborative projects in the social sciences. I value their input greatly as they have much experience in this field and are thus likely to provide the most constructive feedback, however again please do inform me if you are concerned.

Moving on to the manuscript itself, you will be very pleased to note that the initial appraisal of the work was positive. There are so many complicated dimensions to organising collaborative research and the current work provides some useful insights into this process from the perspective of a number of different initiatives. From my own experience, I know this process is challenging and the more that is done in this area to facilitate larger collaborative projects the better.

However, I feel that the work might be undermined by a very descriptive approach, and could be considered to overlap with a number of existing works (published and unpublished) describing the processes adopted within the initiatives (e.g. the PSA Moshontz paper). Partially alluded to by one of the reviewers, all the authors have really valuable experience about the nuances, complications and benefits of adopting this ‘team’ approach but I get a somewhat limited sense of these specific details and experiences from the manuscript. I think this is a potential oversight where there is scope to discuss some of the nuances which might help people design these projects in the future. For example, the dissemination issue raised by the reviewer, or the issue of consortium authorship discussed by the other. One reviewer highlights the importance of discussing elements like participant safety and local collaboration involvement and I completely agree that these nuances are of real value to discuss, so would encourage more of this type of content to help evidence the purpose and contribution of this paper in context of the extant literature. On that basis, I’d consider the expansion of the checklist accompanying the work to be somewhat more nuanced also to reflect more of the complexities. I do not want to constrain you by defining the scope of changes you should make (e.g. embedding these into the text, having case studies for complexities at each stage, or writing additional accompanying materials), but I would encourage you to present a less sanitised account of team science to better share your expertise and to allow for greater recognition for the amazing practices, projects and norm changes that these projects have driven, particularly so given the complexities and barriers!

As always there are also a number of minor areas of clarification suggested by the reviewers, including some rewording and minor content changes. I trust these won’t be problematic. I’d encourage you, to speed up the subsequent consideration of your work, to submit a revised version of the document with a response to feedback document, and/or highlighting all changes made to the text through highlighting/coloured text/tracked changes.

Thanks again for the opportunity to read your work and I sincerely hope this feedback is of benefit. I look forward to reading a revised version of the work in due course, and please don’t hesitate to reach out should you have any further questions or comments.  
Take care and stay safe,  
Dr Thomas Rhys Evans (Tom/He/Him)

# Reviewer 1

##### Rating scale questions

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

##### Open response questions

### Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

I read the work titled ’ A Roadmap to Large-Scale Multi-Country Replications in Psychology’ with great interest. The manuscript provides insight into how different collaborations work in Big Science projects. I found the text readable and well-structured with a great amount of useful information for those who plan to run multi-lab projects.  
Since the manuscript is about the experience of the organisers of these big consortia, I could not find a reason to question them. My comments are fairly minor:

* Table1 column 3 lists “relevant examples of work related to this topic”. I expected to find example studies from the given consortia, for example, from the PSA some successful projects could be listed.
* in the subsection “Considering study value for participants and collaborators” the expression “to the average person in the United States” is used. I found it very colloquial. Maybe “US citizens” would avoid the confusing meaning of the expression.
* I value the advice in the text concerning authorship. Maybe PSA’s recent issue with PNAS could be discussed ( <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2111091119> ) where authors were not allowed to be listed causing personal disadvantages. Also, Big Science runs into other practical difficulties, such as collecting and administering authorship and contributorship. It could be interesting to discuss how journals and publications portals could support these kinds of efforts.

Balazs Aczel

# Reviewer 2

##### Rating scale questions

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

##### Open response questions

### Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

This paper summarizes the experiences and recommendations of several researchers who have experience with multi-country replication efforts. The authors propose that the format is a “road map”

This has nothing to do with my overall evaluation of the paper, but I wanted to add to something in the introduction that the Collaborative Replication and Education Project is an “earlier” effort – this is actually an effort that is ongoing (which I think is implied later in the paper). Totally reasonable to be written the way it is, but I thought it might be helpful if I identified this since I am the current Director of the program (full disclosure!).

This is perhaps related to the point that it would be nice to see some tips for including students in replication work, since there has been a push for students to engage in replication work (see Quintana, 2021). Supervising students comes with its own challenges, such as a tight timeline and authorship issues. However, the current push to involve students in replication is a strong one, and I think deserves some attention.

The tables would really benefit from being rotated into a landscape position on the paper, so the columns are wider. They were difficult to read and compare in portrait page orientation.

Minor point: One thing I might add in the “Preregistration” section is that, if you are planning a direct replication, RRRs can shift direct replications further into the “conceptual” territory (see Hall et al.'s preprint for PSA 004, which is in Stage 2 review by AMPPS). This can lead to some challenging decisions – do we get our students/collaborators guaranteed authorship, or do we stick to our original vision for the project? I also think that saying you’re going to do a direct replication (or “close” replication) is, in itself, a preregistration.

In the “Translation” section, I think the “your grandma is right” statement is cute , but also statements like this can come across as problematic related to age and gender. I recommend changing this to something else.

The translation section makes some very good points about the language; some materials also just don’t make sense in other cultures (for example, an early CREP study referred to “hockey players,” which some international teams changed to “skiiers”). This has come up multiple times in CREP replication work, and has resulted in small divergences from the base materials (such as referred to “Water Buffalo” instead of “Cows” in PSA 004 in our Chinese materials). It has been an important consideration.

In Ethics, something else that I think may be important is deciding on the age of consent to participate in research ahead of time, especially if the host institution’s ethics committee requires different age ranges than other countries. We (in CREP) have had compiled data sets that include 16 and 17 year-olds from different countries that need to be excluded from our overall IRB for the secondary/pooled analysis.

Another consideration under “dissemination” might be that sometimes, individual sites want to report or publish their findings and some times they do this without contacting the project administrators. This varies across cultures, apparently. I would have appreciated reading a paper that identified this as a potential issue before I started doing multi-country replications!

As a reader, I think something I’d really appreciate is to have a checklist that summarizes the main points of this paper, regarding the considerations and decisions that should be made prior to the start of the study and the stakeholders that should be involved in each.

There are a lot of exceptionally important points made in this paper (such as safety of participants and involvement of local collaborators), and I’m grateful to have them located in one place to direct the attention of my own students to these issues. Thank you! This is a great paper, and makes a contribution to the literature that is necessary!

**Scholastica discussion board message**

Oct 18, 2022

Thanks for submitting your work to Collabra: Psychology for consideration. I sincerely enjoyed reading this work and I have great respect for the substantive efforts required behind the scenes to lead and champion these team science approaches.

Firstly, I should note my own conflict of interest as Editor, in that I have worked with some of the authors of this paper or contributed towards such collaborative projects they describe. If you ever feel like any decision or comment is unduly influenced by this then please do let me know and I am happy to stand aside and arrange a change in Editor. Secondly, there are also potential conflicts of interest with our reviewers who have themselves led a number of collaborative projects in the social sciences. I value their input greatly as they have much experience in this field and are thus likely to provide the most constructive feedback, however again please do inform me if you are concerned.

Moving on to the manuscript itself, you will be very pleased to note that the initial appraisal of the work was positive. There are so many complicated dimensions to organising collaborative research and the current work provides some useful insights into this process from the perspective of a number of different initiatives. From my own experience, I know this process is challenging and the more that is done in this area to facilitate larger collaborative projects the better.

However, I feel that the work might be undermined by a very descriptive approach, and could be considered to overlap with a number of existing works (published and unpublished) describing the processes adopted within the initiatives (e.g. the PSA Moshontz paper). Partially alluded to by one of the reviewers, all the authors have really valuable experience about the nuances, complications and benefits of adopting this ‘team’ approach but I get a somewhat limited sense of these specific details and experiences from the manuscript. I think this is a potential oversight where there is scope to discuss some of the nuances which might help people design these projects in the future. For example, the dissemination issue raised by the reviewer, or the issue of consortium authorship discussed by the other. One reviewer highlights the importance of discussing elements like participant safety and local collaboration involvement and I completely agree that these nuances are of real value to discuss, so would encourage more of this type of content to help evidence the purpose and contribution of this paper in context of the extant literature. On that basis, I’d consider the expansion of the checklist accompanying the work to be somewhat more nuanced also to reflect more of the complexities. I do not want to constrain you by defining the scope of changes you should make (e.g. embedding these into the text, having case studies for complexities at each stage, or writing additional accompanying materials), but I would encourage you to present a less sanitised account of team science to better share your expertise and to allow for greater recognition for the amazing practices, projects and norm changes that these projects have driven, particularly so given the complexities and barriers!

As always there are also a number of minor areas of clarification suggested by the reviewers, including some rewording and minor content changes. I trust these won’t be problematic. I’d encourage you, to speed up the subsequent consideration of your work, to submit a revised version of the document with a response to feedback document, and/or highlighting all changes made to the text through highlighting/coloured text/tracked changes.

Thanks again for the opportunity to read your work and I sincerely hope this feedback is of benefit. I look forward to reading a revised version of the work in due course, and please don’t hesitate to reach out should you have any further questions or comments.  
Take care and stay safe,  
Dr Thomas Rhys Evans (Tom/He/Him)

**Author Response**  
Oct 23, 2022

Dear Thomas,

Thank you very much for the quick turnaround and the thorough review!

We are currently working on the revision of the manuscript but wanted to pick up the issue of conflict of interest you mentioned.

Gilad has notified me that you both are close collaborators on an ongoing project and was concerned this may pose a conflict of interest or could cause readers to suspect so.

I have been discussing this with the team, and we were wondering if you were open to the option of a second editor (ideally even the EiC) having an additional look at the review and confirming the review is not biased.

Again, I want to highlight we perceived the reviews as both fair and helpful but simply wanted to ensure there is no impression of receiving preferential treatment. In fact, we realised that this will likely become a recurring issue in the review of Big Team efforts and will add a paragraph on thoughts how to handle such situations.

Thank you very much in advance for considering our proposal!

All the best,

Hannes

**Oct 24, 2022**

Hi Hannes,  
Of course, I will chase this immediately. I will keep you posted as and when I hear anything.  
Thanks,  
Tom

**Oct 24, 2022**

Dear Tom, Hannes,  
  
Thank you both for being so careful about the potential for a conflict of interest. I have carefully read the decision letter and the reviews and my assessment is that they are fair (also note that as senior editor for this section, I had triaged the manuscript at an earlier stage and would have desk rejected the manuscript if I did not think it had potential). So by all means, go ahead with the revisions!  
  
Kind regards,  
Don van Ravenzwaaij, senior editor M&RP

**Oct 25, 2022**

Hi everyone,  
Thank you very much Hannes for your concern about the potential conflict of interest, and Thomas and Don for your careful handling of this issue.  Indeed, typically we would avoid the handling editor being someone who has a recent or ongoing collaboration with one of the authors.  However, sometimes we don't realize these conflicts until we are well into the peer review process, or they happen despite our best intentions.  In this case, I think the approach taken by Tom and Don is a good one (to have Don review the manuscript and decision).  The other thing I would like to do is include this thread in the peer review history that we publish along with the article, so that readers can see that the conflict of interest was considered, and how we dealt with it.  I think this would help protect the authors from the perception that their manuscript was not thoroughly or fairly vetted.  
Best,  
Simine

**Oct 26, 2022**

Dear Tom, Don, and Simine,

Thank you very much for taking our suggestions into account and for your commitment to a fair and impartial review process.

I agree this was a good choice for addressing the situation and I am glad to see Don's assessment finds that the review process has been fair.

I am happy for this thread of exchanges to be publicly included alongside the reviews for transparency. That is a great suggestion!

Many thanks,

Hannes

**Author Response**  
Oct 29, 2022

**Comments from the editor**

Thanks for submitting your work to Collabra: Psychology for consideration. I sincerely enjoyed reading this work and I have great respect for the substantive efforts required behind the scenes to lead and champion these team science approaches.

Firstly, I should note my own conflict of interest as Editor, in that I have worked with some of the authors of this paper or contributed towards such collaborative projects they describe. If you ever feel like any decision or comment is unduly influenced by this then please do let me know and I am happy to stand aside and arrange a change in Editor. Secondly, there are also potential conflicts of interest with our reviewers who have themselves led a number of collaborative projects in the social sciences. I value their input greatly as they have much experience in this field and are thus likely to provide the most constructive feedback, however again please do inform me if you are concerned.

Moving on to the manuscript itself, you will be very pleased to note that the initial appraisal of the work was positive. There are so many complicated dimensions to organising collaborative research and the current work provides some useful insights into this process from the perspective of a number of different initiatives. From my own experience, I know this process is challenging and the more that is done in this area to facilitate larger collaborative projects the better.

However, I feel that the work might be undermined by a very descriptive approach, and could be considered to overlap with a number of existing works (published and unpublished) describing the processes adopted within the initiatives (e.g. the PSA Moshontz paper). Partially alluded to by one of the reviewers, all the authors have really valuable experience about the nuances, complications and benefits of adopting this ‘team’ approach but I get a somewhat limited sense of these specific details and experiences from the manuscript. I think this is a potential oversight where there is scope to discuss some of the nuances which might help people design these projects in the future. For example, the dissemination issue raised by the reviewer, or the issue of consortium authorship discussed by the other. One reviewer highlights the importance of discussing elements like participant safety and local collaboration involvement and I completely agree that these nuances are of real value to discuss, so would encourage more of this type of content to help evidence the purpose and contribution of this paper in context of the extant literature. On that basis, I’d consider the expansion of the checklist accompanying the work to be somewhat more nuanced also to reflect more of the complexities. I do not want to constrain you by defining the scope of changes you should make (e.g. embedding these into the text, having case studies for complexities at each stage, or writing additional accompanying materials), but I would encourage you to present a less sanitised account of team science to better share your expertise and to allow for greater recognition for the amazing practices, projects and norm changes that these projects have driven, particularly so given the complexities and barriers!

As always there are also a number of minor areas of clarification suggested by the reviewers, including some rewording and minor content changes. I trust these won’t be problematic. I’d encourage you, to speed up the subsequent consideration of your work, to submit a revised version of the document with a response to feedback document, and/or highlighting all changes made to the text through highlighting/coloured text/tracked changes.

Thanks again for the opportunity to read your work and I sincerely hope this feedback is of benefit. I look forward to reading a revised version of the work in due course, and please don’t hesitate to reach out should you have any further questions or comments.  
Take care and stay safe,  
Dr Thomas Rhys Evans (Tom/He/Him)

***Reply:***

*Thank you for your thorough review. We are glad that you agree on the importance of this work and its usefulness for future multi-country replications. We have taken your feedback into account, specifically with regard to the checklist, which has been fully reworked. While our overall changes may seem minor in terms of words, we believe they add more nuance as asked and clarify some of our insights better, as well as add some new information previously overlooked. All content changes are highlighted in yellow.*

\_\_\_

**Reviewer 1**

I read the work titled ’ A Roadmap to Large-Scale Multi-Country Replications in Psychology’ with great interest. The manuscript provides insight into how different collaborations work in Big Science projects. I found the text readable and well-structured with a great amount of useful information for those who plan to run multi-lab projects.  
Since the manuscript is about the experience of the organisers of these big consortia, I could not find a reason to question them. My comments are fairly minor:

*Reply: Thank you very much!*

* Table1 column 3 lists “relevant examples of work related to this topic”. I expected to find example studies from the given consortia, for example, from the PSA some successful projects could be listed.

*Reply: Thank you for the suggestion. The table is meant to show the projects which authors have been part of, rather than all successful projects of the consortia. As such, we haven’t included additional PSA publications in this table.*

* in the subsection “Considering study value for participants and collaborators” the expression “to the average person in the United States” is used. I found it very colloquial. Maybe “US citizens” would avoid the confusing meaning of the expression.

*Reply: Thank you for the suggestion, we have changed the wording.*

* I value the advice in the text concerning authorship. Maybe PSA’s recent issue with PNAS could be discussed ( <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2111091119> ) where authors were not allowed to be listed causing personal disadvantages. Also, Big Science runs into other practical difficulties, such as collecting and administering authorship and contributorship. It could be interesting to discuss how journals and publications portals could support these kinds of efforts.

*Reply: That is a great point – In the authorship section, we mentioned the PSA’s recent issue with PNAS and pointed to the Open Letter where PSA explains how they dealt with this. We have also added a suggestion to save time in submitting author information for journals.*

Balazs Aczel

**Reviewer 2**

This paper summarizes the experiences and recommendations of several researchers who have experience with multi-country replication efforts. The authors propose that the format is a “road map”

This has nothing to do with my overall evaluation of the paper, but I wanted to add to something in the introduction that the Collaborative Replication and Education Project is an “earlier” effort – this is actually an effort that is ongoing (which I think is implied later in the paper). Totally reasonable to be written the way it is, but I thought it might be helpful if I identified this since I am the current Director of the program (full disclosure!).

*Reply: The intention was indeed to say that it started earlier - thank you for the note; we have rewritten it to clarify that initiatives are ongoing.*

This is perhaps related to the point that it would be nice to see some tips for including students in replication work, since there has been a push for students to engage in replication work (see Quintana, 2021). Supervising students comes with its own challenges, such as a tight timeline and authorship issues. However, the current push to involve students in replication is a strong one, and I think deserves some attention.

*Reply: Thank you for raising this point. We fully agree it is important to include students, and many of our collaborations have done so, as also highlighted in the description of consortia (particularly, JRP and Core are strongly student-focused, the PSA also regularly has contributors who are still students). We have highlighted the importance again in the concluding remarks, but have decided not to dive deeper into the topic not to lose the main focus of the paper.*

The tables would really benefit from being rotated into a landscape position on the paper, so the columns are wider. They were difficult to read and compare in portrait page orientation.

*Reply: We did not edit them in the first submission, assuming the final layout will be provided by journal copy editors. We apologise for the hard readability and have adjusted these for the revision.*

Minor point: One thing I might add in the “Preregistration” section is that, if you are planning a direct replication, RRRs can shift direct replications further into the “conceptual” territory (see Hall et al.'s preprint for PSA 004, which is in Stage 2 review by AMPPS). This can lead to some challenging decisions – do we get our students/collaborators guaranteed authorship, or do we stick to our original vision for the project? I also think that saying you’re going to do a direct replication (or “close” replication) is, in itself, a preregistration.

*Reply: This is an interesting point. Unfortunately (or maybe fortunately for our previous projects), we have not had that experience yet and would prefer not to hypothesise.*

In the “Translation” section, I think the “your grandma is right” statement is cute , but also statements like this can come across as problematic related to age and gender. I recommend changing this to something else.

*Reply: Thank you for the concern, but we believe the statement will be easily remembered this way and doubt readers would assume it problematic, except someone has ill intent. While the footnote is clearly also in good humour, the first author’s grandmother, a feminist philosopher, is indeed in full support of the phrasing.*

The translation section makes some very good points about the language; some materials also just don’t make sense in other cultures (for example, an early CREP study referred to “hockey players,” which some international teams changed to “skiiers”). This has come up multiple times in CREP replication work, and has resulted in small divergences from the base materials (such as referred to “Water Buffalo” instead of “Cows” in PSA 004 in our Chinese materials). It has been an important consideration.

*Reply: We are glad to hear you agree.*

In Ethics, something else that I think may be important is deciding on the age of consent to participate in research ahead of time, especially if the host institution’s ethics committee requires different age ranges than other countries. We (in CREP) have had compiled data sets that include 16 and 17 year-olds from different countries that need to be excluded from our overall IRB for the secondary/pooled analysis.

*Reply: We have included one sentence about enquiring about age ranges per country. However, since the studies we draw upon from have only been conducted with people 18 or older, we have no personal experience to add.*

Another consideration under “dissemination” might be that sometimes, individual sites want to report or publish their findings and some times they do this without contacting the project administrators. This varies across cultures, apparently. I would have appreciated reading a paper that identified this as a potential issue before I started doing multi-country replications!

*Reply: We have added a suggestion to agree on a dissemination plan early, to avoid such scenarios.*

As a reader, I think something I’d really appreciate is to have a checklist that summarizes the main points of this paper, regarding the considerations and decisions that should be made prior to the start of the study and the stakeholders that should be involved in each.

*Reply: Thank you - we have updated and extended the checklist in Appendix 2. We are also reworking the more visually appealing version for the accompanying repository (*[*https://osf.io/xrv5p/*](https://osf.io/xrv5p/)*).*

There are a lot of exceptionally important points made in this paper (such as safety of participants and involvement of local collaborators), and I’m grateful to have them located in one place to direct the attention of my own students to these issues. Thank you! This is a great paper, and makes a contribution to the literature that is necessary!

*Reply: Thank you very much – we are glad to learn that you agree on the relevance of the issue!*

**Editor Final Decision:** Accept

Nov 28, 2022

Dear Hannes,

Thanks for resubmitting your work following consideration of the feedback from the reviewers. I am grateful also for your contributions to the discussions on conflicts of interest and I am happy to see this will be documented alongside the published manuscript for all to consider and evaluate.

I’m sure you will be very happy to hear that both reviewers have now taken a second look at the work and have evaluated it as suitable for publication. The changes made to their suggestions were of appropriate scope and nature, and excluding a single comment about grandmothers (I would stand with the reviewer on this one and would still encourage you to remove this), there is consensus between us all in recommending publication.

My own view is that this work provides a clear framework of key considerations to implementing replications across different geographical areas. I would have liked to get more of a sense of the real-world complications and nuances that impact these sorts of projects as this space is evolving quickly and guidance is poorly distributed (both in terms of extent of discussion (limited) and in terms of being held by specific (priveleged) groups of people). However, I also recognise that I have some experience in leading international research collaborations and so might not be the exact target audience. I have therefore decided not to request further changes to the manuscript, anticipating that as these types of international projects continue to evolve and unfold, the supplementary resources to this manuscript are better able to respond and change. Whilst I was disappointed by the lack of more in-depth discussions, I have no doubt that someone planning an international collaborative research project would benefit from this work, regardless of extent of their experience or background. I am also of the opinion that the supporting OSF page will be a super useful resource and I hope this also gets the investment and subsequent attention it deserves.

I recommend publication of this work on the expectation that those reading this work will be encouraged and supported by it, to implement these more ambitious and impactful projects. I hope that we can continue to look at scientific work as a collaborative endeavor where we are stronger together than when competing, and I am grateful for your contributions to this culture,

Stay safe and take care,  
Dr Thomas Rhys Evans (Tom/He/Him)

# Reviewer 1

##### Rating scale questions

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

##### Open response questions

### Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

I found the authors’ reply and revision satisfactory. I have no further comments.

# Reviewer 2

##### Rating scale questions

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

##### Open response questions

### Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

I have looked over the revised version and appreciate the edits and changes the authors have chosen to make.

Regarding the “grandmother” statement: I encourage the authors to reflect on impact v. intent here. I believe the choice to leave this statement in the paper is the wrong choice, but the authors and I can diverge on that point without it harming my overall assessment of the work and its potential contribution to the literature.

This is an interesting paper and as a person who oversees international multisite projects with students, it has given me some fresh perspectives and considerations. I do not have any more comments or suggestions.

Sincerely,  
Jordan Wagge