

Peer Review Comments

Article: Breil, S. M., Geukes, K., Wilson, R. E., Nestler, S., Vazire, S., & Back, M. D. (2019). Zooming into Real-Life Extraversion – how Personality and Situation Shape Sociability in Social Interactions. *Collabra: Psychology*, 5(1): 7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.170>

Article type: Original Research Report

Editor: M. Brent Donnellan

Article submitted: 23 May 2018

Editor decision: Accept Submission

Revision submitted: 26 November 2018

Article accepted: 16 December 2018

Article published: 16 January 2019

Responses for Version 1

Reviewer C:

1) General comments and summary of recommendation

Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:

- Are the methodologies used appropriate?
- Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
- Is all statistical analysis sound?
- Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
- Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
- Are the references adequate and appropriate?:

This paper was a pleasure to review. The authors should be commended for several exemplary features: clear writing style, exhaustive literature review, sound theoretical rationale, use of multiple methods, large sample sizes (both between- and within-person), complex and appropriate statistical analyses, exemplary documentation of data and code, informative and supportive figures, precise interpretations of results, and persuasive links between results and existing theories. In my opinion, the paper could almost be accepted “as is.” I have just a few comments below.

In the very first paragraph on p. 3, the authors should check whether causal language (e.g., “consequences”, “increased”) accurately describes the findings of the studies mentioned. It might be more accurate to say that sociability is related to “higher” levels of the other variables dependent on whether the results were from experimental studies.

In the examples involving Andy and Patsy on p. 3, the situation effects and personality-situation effects are apparent, but I didn’t quite see the example of a pure personality effect. Maybe I’m missing something in the example, but a personality effect could be more effectively communicated by stating that Andy, on average, acts more sociable than Patsy across similar situations (I realize that

this may be inferred across the two situations mentioned, but it's still somewhat ambiguous).

Categorical situational codings applied to open answers for situations are referred to as "objective," which could be problematic. The authors already address this to some extent on p. 52: "Nevertheless, the initial categorization of situational features was based on self-reports and, especially the open responses used in Study 1, may have already contained filtering through the lens of the participants' views (cf. Sherman et al., 2015)." I wondered if the authors could make clear earlier in the paper that the categorical situational codings involve subjective perceptions (e.g., two people in the same situation may describe the situation differently and thus the category assigned could differ across people) and perhaps not apply the term "objective" to these codings.

2) Figures/tables/data availability:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures, if relevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here):

Excellent use of tables and figures, and the underlying data is available.

3) Ethical approval:

If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.

If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required:

These statements should be added to the Method sections for Study 1 and 2.

4) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process:

The writing was of high quality and was jargon free throughout.

Reviewer D:

1) General comments and summary of recommendation

Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:

- Are the methodologies used appropriate?
- Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
- Is all statistical analysis sound?
- Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
- Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
- Are the references adequate and appropriate?:

2) Figures/tables/data availability:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures, if relevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here):

3) Ethical approval:

If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.

If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required:

4) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process.

Editor Decision for Version 1

Editor: Brent Donnellan

Affiliation: Michigan State University

Editor decision: Revisions Required

Decision date: 27 September 2018

Dear Mr Simon Mats Breil,

Thank you for submitting your work to Collabra: Psychology. I have now received two reviews from individuals who are extraordinarily well qualified to review this paper. I thank them for their service to this journal. As is my standard practice, I read your paper carefully and then I read the comments from the two reviewers.

Both reviewers were positive about the paper and provided constructive suggestions. No fatal flaws were identified in the review process. The paper is well written, the topic is interesting, the datasets are impressive, and the work is solid. The bottom line was positive so I can move forward with a revise decision. I do not plan to send this back out for review and thus the time lag to the final decision should be greatly reduced if and when you submit the revised manuscript. My plan would be to review the new version and the letter of response and then make a final up or down decision.

The reviewers did an outstanding job and you should address each of their concerns either in the revised text or in the response letter. I will highlight some issues that came up as I read your paper. My comments are mostly minor as I think this paper was in excellent shape for an initial submission. You and your coauthors might disagree with some (or all) of the points so feel free to pushback against any suggestions you believe will harm your work. Just describe your counterpoints in the letter.

1. This is minor, but are personality and situations typically seen as “powerful” predictors of behavior (p. 7)? This might be a little strong as I am not convinced personality traits are powerful predictors of single acts in a given setting. You might disagree but I think it might enhance the paper to use language that is slightly weaker (and less causal in places; see Reviewer C).

2. On page 8, first whole paragraph: Is “the” needed before Trait Activation Theory?

3. I think the Introduction is especially long. I think some degree of streamlining will help people get to the method and results sections sooner. I did not have specific feedback but I think a 10 page Introduction would be far preferable to the 13 pages in the current version. Again, this is a minor issue but I thought I would provide this feedback to you.

4. Was Extraversion assessed on a 15-point scale in Study 1? This might deserve comment as that is not a typical response option for the BFI. (I also doubt this matters a great deal).

5. Do the results hold if you just use informant-reported Extraversion (or just self-reports) rather than the composite with both self- and informant-reports? This might make for a useful footnote.

Those were the issues that I noted and I think they are all addressable. Again, feel free to push back if something I suggest seems ridiculous to you. Please also address all other reviewer concerns (these were not extensive so I do not think it will take considerable time to be thorough).

To access your submission account, follow the below instructions:

1) login to the journal webpage with username and password

- 2) click on the submission title
- 3) click 'Review' menu option
- 4) download Reviewed file and make revisions based on review feedback
- 5) upload the edited file
- 6) Click the 'notify editor' icon and email the confirmation of re-submission and any relevant comments to the journal.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing; therefore, please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please do contact us. Could you have the revisions submitted within 60 days? If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know.

Thank you for trusting us with your work. Good luck with the revision.

Brent Donnellan

Michigan State University

donnel59@msu.edu

Author's Response to Review Comments for Version 1

Author: Simon Mats Breil

Affiliation: University of Münster, DE

Revision submitted: 26 November 2018

Dear Prof Donnellan,

thank you very much for your email of September 27, 2018 and the two very helpful and constructive reviews of our manuscript "Zooming into real-life extraversion-How Personality and Situation Shape Sociability in Social Interactions" submitted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. We have now uploaded the revision as well as the replies to all editorial and reviewer comments.

We hope that our detailed revision now allows you to evaluate our manuscript as suitable for publication in Collabra: Psychology . Thank you very much for considering the manuscript.

Yours sincerely

Simon Breil (on behalf of all authors)

Attached document:

<https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/ubiquity-partner-network/ucp/journal/collabra/170-2573-1-SP.docx>

Editor Decision for Version 2

Editor: Brent Donnellan

Affiliation: Michigan State University

Editor decision: Accept Submission

Decision date: 16 December 2018

Dear Mr Simon Mats Breil,

Thank you for submitting your revision to Collabra: Psychology. I followed the process outlined in my initial decision letter: I read your revision and letter of response to make a final decision. I found all responses reasonable so I am happy to accept this paper. Thank you for your responsiveness and attention to detail. This is an impressive paper.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. The accepted submission will now undergo final copyediting. You will be contacted once this is complete to answer any queries that may have arisen during copyediting and to allow a final chance to edit the files prior to typesetting. If you wish to view your submission during this time, you can log in via the journal website.

The review information should be included in this email.

Sincerely,

M. Brent Donnellan

Michigan State University

donnel59@msu.edu