

# Peer Review Comments

**Article:** The Effect of Concrete Wording on Truth Judgements: A Preregistered Replication and Extension of Hansen & Wänke (2010)

**Article type:** Registered report

**Editor:** Rolf Zwaan

**Stage 1 submitted:** 06 September 2018

**Editor decision:** in principle acceptance (IPA)

**Revision stage 1 submitted:** 13 October 2018

**Stage 1 accepted:** 15 October 2018

**Stage 2 submitted:** 14 February 2019

**Editor decision:** Accept submission

**Revision stage 2 submitted:** 25 March 2019

**Article accepted:** 25 March 2019

**Article published:** 30 April 2019

---

## Responses for Stage 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?:

I would like to start by giving the authors complements for their thorough job with this manuscript, I think this is an exemplary piece of work. Next to the fact that the replication is well thought-out and planned in according to the necessary steps (e.g., with good documentation of what the confirmatory hypotheses are, with collaboration with original authors, with predetermined exclusion rules, etc.), and that I agree that there is replication value, I also really like the integration with RMarkdown and the precision with which the authors have written down their 'if this then ..' forks. I really enjoyed reading this manuscript, because this shows how careful planning can really benefit science (e.g., being able to make a Qualtrics for study 1b first and use that lay-out for the paper and pencil to keep consistent).

I have been trying to find things that can be improved but the things I come up with are a matter of preference rather than necessity. In other words, I do not want to delay this research with lengthy comments and I recommend providing in principle acceptance.

I do however have a note for the general structure of the submission, because as a reviewer it was not

immediately clear to me that this was a stage 1 submission. Although there are notes in caps in the paper, I would prefer having an additional statement at the top with some clarification on for instance the past tense use (reviewing would be facilitated and although it's not a big issue for this particular study, in some cases it is valuable to know whether there is, or isn't, ethical approval already in place, and the past tense suggests there is, but the tense is used in order to automatically fill the paper later, so this remains unclear even though as a reviewer one should be able to evaluate ethical rigor).

Suggestions:

- Maybe add one sentence in the manuscript about how paper-and-pencil materials will be digitalized (and stored).
- It may be good to rephrase the study information sheet to clarify the anonymized sharing of the data online (it now reads: "The information that you provide will be maintained in a strictly confidential manner and will not be available to anyone outside the project team.") although this might be irb specific phrasing.
- Describe if there are outlier cutoffs or assumption checks for the main data.
- The correlations in table 3 do not make much sense to me, perhaps discuss their relevance.
- For reproducibility, add info on the dependencies and software versions (e.g., R session info) to the osf

Typo's:

- p1. ("is by")
- p4. "Before conducting the study, we following the same procedures used by ...",
- p7. "our plan was to continue recruiting participants until we had used usable data from 210 participants

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):

Tables are appropriate, and at this stage there is no real data to plot (I did not come across a plan to implement figures either).

Reproducibility is high due to use of RMarkdown and test runs with fake data.

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.:

Ethical approval: see comment above: I am not sure whether there is any yet, but I foresee no problems with it. Informed consent will be obtained adequately.

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.:

This manuscript is well written and easy to follow (even despite the fact that it has the necessary IF statements)

-----

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?:

Overall, I believe the authors have done an exemplary job in preparing this manuscript. The level of scientific rigor is apparent, and the attention to detail with regards to every aspect of the replication is appreciated.

I have a few minor suggestions that the authors might consider, but none of them would prevent moving forward.

1. On page 1 of the manuscript the authors discuss the connection between abstract statements and those of passive voice. This discussion includes some clarification from J. Hansen ("map the criteria of the LCM of abstractness"), but I wonder if additional clarification about the connection between the abstract characteristics and passive voice would be worth discussing here.

2. On page 3 in the Materials section, the authors mention that the statements were evaluated so that "the abstract and concrete versions used equally common language." Was that equality evaluated in any specific way?

3. On page 5, the authors discuss distribution of the questionnaire packets. Are there any plans for limits to the number of participants in the room during data collection? I would not anticipate any effects of varying group sizes, but clarity would be useful.

4. Also on page 5, the authors mention that "given that the testing sessions for the USA in-person sample were of longer duration, those participants completed an additional unrelated task following completion of the study." Perhaps I am misunderstanding this, but why would an additional task be added to the sessions that were already of a longer duration?

In summary, I recommend this preregistered investigation be approved.

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):

All of the tables were justified and helpful.

Table 5 does appear to have a formatting issue with the dividing lines between rows.

Tables 4 and 6 include a gender label of 'Other.' It might be worth considering use of an alternative label (or labels) in this case to avoid perception of othering. I appreciate the balance that needs to be maintained between clarity and brevity in a table, so please take this as a minor recommendation.

All code, materials and simulation data were made available for review and were easily accessible.

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.:

Statements of approval from the appropriate ethical boards were included in the manuscript.

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.

-----

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?:

The authors propose to replicate the Linguistic Truth Effect originally reported by Hansen & Wänke (2010). In the original paper, Hansen & Wänke found that concretely worded statements (e.g., The Naab flows into the Danube) were rated as more probably true than abstractly worded statements (e.g., The Naab is a confluent of the Danube) when truth was rated on a six point scale (1=definitely false, 6=defiantly true). In the original study this effect was reported in four separate experiments, each of which was statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).

	Mean truth rating - Concrete		Mean truth rating - Abstract	Mean difference
Exp 1	3.58	3.45		0.13
Exp 2	3.61	3.51		0.1
Exp 3	3.63	3.55		0.08
Exp 4	3.57	3.41		0.16

I am in support of independent replications and this study is a good candidate given that it has been widely cited and is based on effects of a very small magnitude, with the largest effect being a 0.16 point difference on a 6 point scale.

This replication and extension is definitely worthwhile, but I do feel this protocol requires a little more work. There are some methodological differences between the original study and the replication protocol. Most of these are briefly acknowledged in the section 'Known differences from the original study'. This is an important section and I feel it should be given more prominence by placing it directly after the method section, so that the reader will have these differences in mind when interpreting the results. More importantly, this section needs to be expanded to acknowledge the potential impact of these differences. The biggest change from the original study is that replication is being conducted in English, rather than German. The potential impact of this change should be discussed. Is there any theoretical or practical reason why you would not expect the result to replicate in English? (i.e., is there any reason to believe that English and German speakers mentally represent concrete and abstract language in different ways?)

If the replication finds data that are inconsistent with the original, what will you be able to conclude? Would you conclude that the inconsistency is due to the original effect being a false positive (a very strong interpretation) or would you conclude that the effect does not occur when using English stimuli and English speaking participants (a weaker interpretation). The latter seems to be the only interpretation that can drawn with confidence.

Details of the procedure should be clarified and if these differ from the original, this should be acknowledged and the potential impact briefly discussed. For example, it is not clear in the first study (1a) how participants will be tested. Will they be tested in large groups or individual cubicles? How does this differ from the original study? Likewise in terms of data treatment, there are several criteria for excluding data - you should acknowledge how these differ from the data treatment strategy used by Hansen & Wänke.

Finally in the discussion section I suggest you discuss the effect size of any significant differences. The original study reported very small effects. If the data are consistent with the original study but also have very small effect sizes what can be concluded about the importance of this effect?

Overall, I'm in support of this replication attempt but would like to see more in-depth discussion of how this replication differs from the original, the potential impact of these differences and the effects these differences might have on the conclusions that can be drawn.

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):

all fine

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.:

A statement of Ethical approval is 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.:

Fine

---

## Editor Decision for Version 1

**Editor:** Rolf Zwaan

**Affiliation:** Erasmus University, Netherlands

**Editor decision:** Revisions Required

**Decision date:** 11 October 2018

Dear Mrs. Henderson,

I have now received three reviews of your manuscript. As you will see, all three reviewers are very positive about your submission. I share this evaluation.

The reviewers raise some issues that they would like you to address and have some suggestions. My sense is that the concerns, which are reasonable, can be addressed fairly straightforwardly. This is why I regard the "revisions required" judgment as "minor revisions required." In practice, this means that I will not send out your revision again and am confident I will be able to act quickly on a revision.

I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,

Rolf A. Zwaan

---

## **Author's Response to Review Comments for Version 1**

**Author:** Emma L. Henderson

**Affiliation: Revision submitted:** 13 October 2018

Dear Prof. Zwaan,

Thank you for the thoughtful and constructive reviews. We have described our responses to each reviewer comment in the attached file, and we believe the changes have improved the clarity of the manuscript. Below we have copied each reviewer comment in full and have inserted our response beneath each comment (indented).

We hope our revisions address all of the points raised, and look forward to your response to our revision.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Henderson

### **Attached document:**

<https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/ubiquity-partner-network/ucp/journal/collabra/192-2433-1-AT.pdf>

---

## **Editor Decision for Version 2**

**Editor:** Rolf Zwaan

**Affiliation:** Erasmus University, Netherlands

**Editor decision:** Accept submission

**Decision date:** 15 October 2018

Dear Mrs Emma Louise Henderson,

After review, we have reached a decision regarding your submission to Collabra: Psychology, "The Effect of Concrete Wording on Truth Judgements: A Preregistered Replication and Extension of Hansen & Wänke (2010)", and are happy to provisionally accept your preregistered for publication, pending data collection, analysis, and reporting. We look forward to seeing the final version of the paper.

Kind regards,

Rolf Zwaan

Erasmus University, Netherlands

rolfzwaan@gmail.com

---

## 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?:

Overall, this paper is written in a very transparent and reproducible way, and my enthusiasm has not faded compared to stage 1. I think the authors did a great job and I recommend minor revisions below.

I have three main things I think the authors could pay attention to (or discuss to make sure the thinking is correct), and with these I hope to make this already great manuscript even better.

1) Phrasing. I realise that it would have been better to have suggested changes to the text in phase 1, but if the authors agree that the following would make the final product better than I suggest making some small changes to the phrasing, because papers like this one could really set the right example with respect to the way things are talked about (something that I think is very important, and impactful on the practices used by other researchers as well).

The general conclusion is that the findings are inconsistent with the original finding. I am trying to optimize the phrasing of the sentences that convey this conclusion; but as with any replication, our field is not in the stage where we have stable theoretical fundamentals to allow really clear conclusions of what a replication means (or clear definitions of words like 'inconsistent'). The following suggestions come up:

a) On page 6, the authors write "Given that the t-test was not statistically significant, we compared the upper confidence bound around the observed effect ...". I think it would be better not to start that paragraph (and other paragraphs that mimic it) with 'given that ..' because the inferiority test should not depend on the significance of the test (the t-test could have been significant but the effect so small it still smaller than the bound, although this is not likely to happen when you set your bound based on the power of the design). I would suggest starting these paragraphs with something like 'To be able to interpret the outcome of the t-test, we compared the upper...'

b) Same paragraph on page 6, the authors write "Because the upper bound of the confidence interval was smaller than 0.228, the observed difference between truth ratings for the concrete and abstract statements was statistically equivalent to an effect no bigger than Cohen's  $d_z = 0.228$ ." It might be better not to use the word 'equivalent' in this way because you are testing in one direction (but correct me if I'm wrong about this). The effect could be large and negative, and still be inferior to .228, but not equivalent to an effect smaller than .228 in either direction. Perhaps use something like 'statistically inferior to a positive effect of Cohen's  $d_z = 0.228$ .'

c) The authors base their sampling plan on the feasibility of a certain sample size, and then a sensitivity power analysis to determine the smallest effect size with 95% power. The lower bound (of  $D_z = .228$ ) is therefore not directly related to the original finding, and this makes me doubt whether it is right to claim that the inferiority test tells you whether your finding is consistent with the original or not. For example, you could run a very low-powered replication and find a non-significant result. If you follow that up with an inferiority test based on your own power, the bound might be  $d=0.9$ . If you find that this test is significant, can you really claim that the finding is inconsistent with the original results? Maybe if you compare your effect size with the effect size found in the original study. But if you do that, perhaps you should simply relate the bound of your inferiority test to the effect size of the original study.

To be a little more precise about this, perhaps replace the following sentence: "For the original items, the upper bound of the confidence interval around the effect was smaller than our smallest effect of interest, meaning that the data were inconsistent with the original finding. Similarly, for the revised items, the data were inconsistent with the original finding." (p.9) with a little more nuanced sentence like (I am giving a very long example in order to hopefully explain this point clear): "For the original items, the upper bound of the confidence interval around the effect was smaller (less positive) than our smallest effect we could detect with high power based on our feasibility constraints, meaning that the data did not favor the conclusion of being consistent with the original finding as defined by our predefined criteria. And therefore, overall we conclude ..."

Next to this, I think it would be good to add a sentence to the discussion explaining that if future researchers want to study this effect, they would likely need to increase their sample size drastically if they want to continue studying this effect.

2) Reproducibility of scripts. Although very transparent and reproducible, I found some hiccups in trying to knit the Markdown file, and I suggest the authors try to get to the bottom of this so others can truly take these files as examples in their own work/teaching/reproducing. Perhaps this is due to some differences in packages or operating system, or due to my not downloading or finding the correct files, but in that case please see if some words can be spend on detailing this in the readme's (to have the most impact it should be very easy for others to run this, and I could have delved deeper into the code but I think others will put in a similar or smaller amount of effort before they give up, and that would be a shame).

To explain my hiccups:

I could not find the references.bib (referenced in the readme for knitting the Rmarkdown) and I suspect compiling will be difficult without a reference list.

While trying to knit, the chunk 'r import\_and\_munge\_data' gave me an error that indicated that I should have a directory named 'output' in my working directory (or that the code was trying to make that but couldn't), otherwise line 387 (`write.csv(outputFile, file = "output/allRawData.csv")`) would not work.

After making that directory by hand in order to be able to continue, I am still stuck in the chunk 'r import\_and\_munge\_data', where I get the following message many times (not sure if this is a problem):

```
Expected 6 pieces. Missing pieces filled with `NA` in 60 rows [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, ...].Expected 6 pieces. Missing pieces filled with `NA` in 60 rows [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, ...]
```

And at the point where the `ttestBF` is supposed to run, I get an error saying `x` or `y` must not contain `NA` or infinite values. Both `x` and `y` turned out to have an `NA` in row 114, because if I run the `ttestBF` sepetately without row 114, it does work (namely, with "`ttestBF(x = lab_only$unknown_concrete_M_original52_all[-114], y = lab_only$unknown_abstract_M_original52_all[-114], paired=TRUE, null.interval=c(0, Inf), rscale=0.336)`"). And that gives me the results reported in the paper. This could be a difference in packages (that mine doesn't skip NAs), but I stopped trying to debug at this point.

In other words, if these things are not due to an error on my part, please fix. In general, I would suggest (for future scripts) to not name objects with names that are common names of functions, as this is somewhat confusing (e.g., file, source).

3) As mentioned, this work is very high in reproducibility, not in the least due to the use of RMarkdown. However, most of the intended readers will not have seen the first draft or find it for manual comparison. I would therefore suggest some words about the process (e.g., one small summary of that X paragraphs were added to the original in order to cover 1) additional exclusion criteria due to unforeseen circumstances (p.x), 2) justification of ... and 3) ... etc.) or about the differences between plan and execution (e.g. a table with the differences like the (very transparent!) tables about the differences in participants recruited/excluded/analyzed). This comparison could be in the supplementary material, although a disclosure statement about any changes would be valuable for the reader to find in the paper itself. Similarly, the authors make comparing study 1a and 1b very easy with some small hints to the reader ("as in experiment 1a, we..."). I would suggest reading through the text and doing the same for comparing planned and actual methods/statistics. For example, on page 5, I would suggest starting the sentence "We excluded responses to ..." with "As per our preregistered exclusion criteria, we excluded ..." (or something to that effect). Also it would be informative to give the counts of specific exclusions for these (you do give them for the non-registered criteria) in the next paragraph.

Smaller remarks/questions/issues:

- The online files are documented well (I checked the osf and found that the supplementary materials referenced were easily identified online, readme's were in place.)

- p.3 With the statement "(with our sample size, we have greater than 95% power to detect an effect that is 50% the size of the original", is the first original experiment meant (and not the second)? then please explicitly say so for clarity, because mentioning the other effect size from the original (even though that study is not the target of direct replication) is signaling that this is also an important effect size to keep in mind (and it probably should be, so leave it in), but that one is much smaller and doesn't allow saying that this replication has 50% the power of the original).

- p.6 Authors write "For completeness, we report the results of a comparable ANOVA (adding country as a factor) in the online supplementary materials at <https://osf.io/s2389/>." perhaps one sentence to discuss the results of the anova's would be in place (could be very brief and merely saying how the main effects of the concreteness effect compare to the t-tests).

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):

Availability is good, adequate underlying data is available, see comment on knitting the RMarkdown.

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.:

all in order.

#### 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.:

well written.

-----

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?:

I think this project and manuscript turned out very well, which is not surprising given the strength of the stage 1 submission. I commend the authors on their thorough job with this project. I think it will serve as an excellent example of many aspects of the process of registered replication, including detailed planning at all stage and in all aspects of the project.

I had a few minor comments on the previous draft, and it appears that all were addressed by the authors.

#### 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 table are appropriate and helpful.

One minor issue: Table 5 seems to have a formatting issue with some of the horizontal lines not extending all the way through the table. It could be a rendering issue on my end.

All code, materials and simulation data were made available for review and were easily accessible.

#### 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.:

Statements of approval from the appropriate ethical boards were included in the manuscript.

#### 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 structured and written.

-----

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?:

The authors have executed their pre-registered study to a high standard. The data are thoroughly and transparently analysed. I am convinced by the authors conclusions: the results of these highly powered studies do not provide support for the linguistic truth effect. No single study is definitive, but the high quality of this replication mean it is the best evidence available at this time.

#### 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):

Figures and Tables are Fine

#### 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.:

Ethical approval was granted

#### 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.:

Well written

---

## Editor Decision for stage 2

**Editor:** Rolf Zwaan

**Affiliation:** Erasmus University, Netherlands

**Editor decision:** Revisions required

**Decision date:** 11 March 2019

Dear Mrs. Henderson,

After review, we have reached a decision regarding your submission to *Collabra: Psychology*, "The Effect of Concrete Wording on Truth Judgements: A Preregistered Replication and Extension of Hansen & Wänke (2010)". Our decision is to request (minor) revisions of the manuscript prior to acceptance for publication.

As you will see, the reviewers are generally positive about this version of the manuscript. Reviewer B has one minor point that needs to be addressed, while reviewer C is fine with the manuscript as is. The most extensive comments are those by Reviewer A, although even these can be addressed without too much effort. Nevertheless, I think these comments are important to consider, and therefore I would like you to do so in a final revision. I expect to be able to make a final decision soon after this.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please do contact me.

Kind regards,

Rolf Zwaan

Erasmus University, Netherlands

rolfzwaan@gmail.com

---

## Author's Response to Review Comments for Version 1

**Author:** Emma L. Henderson

**Affiliation:** Kingston University, Kingston upon Thames, UK

**Revision submitted:** 25 March 2019

Dear Prof. Zwaan,

Thank you for the speedy and detailed stage 2 reviews. We have submitted our response to reviewers as a supplementary file. We copied each reviewer comment in full, and where required, have inserted our response beneath each comment (indented).

We hope our revisions address all of the points raised, and look forward to your response to our revision.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Henderson

**Attached document:**

<https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/ubiquity-partner-network/ucp/journal/collabra/192-2431-3-ED.pdf>

---

**Editor Decision for Version 2**

**Editor:** Rolf Zwaan

**Affiliation:** Erasmus University, Netherlands

**Editor decision:** Accept submission

**Decision date:** 25 March 2019

Dear Mrs Emma Louise Henderson,

I have reached a decision regarding your submission to Collabra: Psychology, "The Effect of Concrete Wording on Truth Judgements: A Preregistered Replication and Extension of Hansen & Wänke (2010)." I am happy to accept your submission for publication, pending the completion of copyediting and formatting processes.

Congratulations on a job well done. I anticipate that your paper will become a model for other reproducible registered replication reports.

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,

Rolf Zwaan

Erasmus University, Netherlands

[rolfzwaan@gmail.com](mailto:rolfzwaan@gmail.com)