

Peer Review Comments

Article: Mota, S., et al. (2019). A Comprehensive Examination of Narcissists' Self-Perceived and Actual Socioemotional Cognition Ability. *Collabra: Psychology*, 5(1): 6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.174>

Article type: Review Article

Editor: Rebecca Schlegel

Article submitted: 08 June 2018

Editor decision: Accept Submission

Revision submitted: 25 October 2018

Article accepted: 03 December 2018

Article published: 08 January 2019

Responses for Version 1

Reviewer A:

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?:

The authors aimed to better understand links between grandiose narcissism and socio-emotional cognition by differentiating grandiose narcissism into agentic and antagonistic aspects, and socio-emotional cognition into self-concept and actual ability aspects. I have reviewed this manuscript for other journals, and I will start off by saying that this is the strongest version of the manuscript that I have seen. I applaud the authors for their transparency, and their meta-analytic integration of the findings. I also appreciate the investigation of self-enhancement towards the end of the manuscript given that this question naturally stems from the initial two studies. I believe that this manuscript holds the potential to make an important contribution to the literature. My only piece of advice for making the manuscript stronger would be to see if the authors can better streamline and shorten the manuscript. Given the similarity of the two studies, I believe that more can be done to eliminate redundancy.

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):

I think all of the figures and tables are clear.

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:

I did not see mention of IRB approval. This may need to be included.

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 manuscript is well-written and clear.

Reviewer B:

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 set of studies takes on a major area of confusion in the narcissism literature -- the narcissism and SEC (as they term it) debate -- and come up with an integrative solution that makes a great deal of sense.

My guess is not that this is the end of the road on this topic, but will be a major regrouping area. I will cite this work often.

I only have a couple comments/concerns:

1) The SEC terminology was hard to follow, especially with subscripts. Maybe it is because I read SEC as college sports, but I think a better label would help. Or just socioemotional cognition - actual, etc.

2) It is hard to know how to report data anymore. The authors took the "open science" approach of putting it out there as collected. This made the paper longer, but I think it is an appropriate approach -- it helped me make sense of the authors' thought process.

3. The intro was similarly long, but again I think it makes sense in this case. The area is so fraught with "nuance" that a thorough review was needed. Indeed, I think this intro will benefit the field.

The other option is to lay a lot of the details in supplements and then write a short paper with essentially one study. This would be more digestible for readers.

In sum, I really liked this paper. I would have loved to see a three-factor breakdown of narcissism in addition to the two, but that will be for a future student. I am curious to see what this would look like if neuroticism and antagonism were more cleanly separated. Overall, I appreciate the authors digging through this literature and putting out a very useful work.

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):

These were good. I think the raw correlations would be nice to have in the main paper as well.

That three-dimensional figure was a little strange to read, but sort of fun.

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.:

yes

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.:

yes

Editor Decision for Version 1

Editor: Rebecca Schlegel

Affiliation: Texas A&M University, US

Editor decision: Revisions Required

Decision date: 04 September 2018

Dear Mr. Mota,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration by Collabra. I have now received two reviews of your manuscript from highly qualified researchers with specific expertise related to narcissism. I thank them for their service to this journal. I also independently read the manuscript before consulting these reviews.

As you will see, both reviewers were positively disposed to the paper (as was I). Along with the reviewers, I commend your commitment to transparency and the thoroughness in the reporting of your results. This work strikes me as very clear example of the type of rigorous work that Collabra aims to publish. As such I am inviting you to revise this work per the minor suggestions raised in both of the reviews. Note that these suggestions are mostly stylistic in nature and are focused on increasing the clarity of presentation. As both authors note, the manuscript is quite long and could likely be streamlined. I also wanted to echo the concern that some of the terminology is a little confusing. Along with the abbreviations, I found the use of the word "self-concept" a little unusual and wondered if simply "perceived" would work better. The comparison between perceived and actual ability seems a little more natural to me. In any case, I leave it to you how exactly to proceed with your revisions given the nature of the concerns raised.

In sum, I think this is very well done work and look forward to receiving your revision. Thank you for submitting to Collabra.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Schlegel

Author's Response to Review Comments for Version 1

Author: Simon Mota

Affiliation: University of Münster, DE

Revision submitted: 25 October 2018

Dear Prof Schlegel,

please note that I have just submitted the revised version of our manuscript "Narcissists' Socioemotional Cognition Ability Revisited: Evidence for a Differentiated Approach". As requested, I uploaded the response letter, the revised figures 1 and 2, and the revised supplement document via the 'Summary' page.

Yours sincerely

Simon Mota

Attached document:

<https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/ubiquity-partner-network/ucp/journal/collabra/174-2499-1-SP.docx>

Editor Decision for Version 2

Editor: Rebecca Schlegel

Affiliation: Texas A&M University, US

Editor decision: Revisions Required

Decision date: 10 December 2018

Dear Mr Simon Mota,

First, let me apologize for the delay in getting you this decision. It was entirely my fault and had nothing to do with the quality of your submission. I am pleased to report that I have reviewed your revision and I am happy to accept your submission for publication, pending the completion of copyediting and formatting processes. Excellent work with the revisions, I felt they addressed all the concerns raised by myself and the reviewers.

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.

Kind regards,

Dr Rebecca Schlegel
Texas A&M University
schlegelrj@gmail.com