

Peer Review Comments

Article: Steingroever, H, Fridberg, D J, Horstmann, A, Kjome, K L, Kumari, V, Lane, S D, Maia, T V, McClelland, J L, Pachur, T, Premkumar, P, Stout, J C, Wetzels, R, Wood, S, Worthy, D A and Wagenmakers, E-J 2015 Data from 617 Healthy Participants Performing the Iowa Gambling Task: A "Many Labs" Collaboration. *Journal of Open Psychology Data* 3:e5, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/jopd.ak>

Article submitted: 28 November 2014

Article accepted: 30 March 2015

Article published: 24 June 2015

Editor: Jelte M. Wicherts

Responses for Version 1

Reviewer A: Kevin van Kalkeren

Review Completed: 10 March 2015

The Steingroever et al. manuscript, entitled Psychology Data from Healthy Participants Performing the Iowa Gambling Task: A "Many Labs" Collaboration, provides the data and description of a many labs project, wherein 10 independent studies used either (a variant of) the traditional IGT payoff scheme (Bechara et al., 1994) or the payoff scheme introduced by Bechara & Damasio (2002).

The manuscript itself is well-written, and I cannot find significant aspects to be improved upon. After revision of the data set, the only serious remark I can make is that perhaps it would be more convenient to have the data more integrated, and as a result, presented in less files. But in this way, they are already quite manageable, and I would therefore recommend this paper to be published.

It is my belief that this manuscript will certainly be of good influence on the field of (economic) psychology.

Reviewer B: Name not given

Review Completed: 10 March 2015

This data paper describes data from the Iowa Gambling Task (IGT) in a large sample of healthy adults. The paper is clear, well written and the authors present concrete and useful suggestions for reuse. Also data are described accurately, properly archived and are openly accessible on the Open Science Framework. This is a highly valuable dataset for future studies into IGT performance.

I have two minor comments:

1. The references to datasets from Steingroever could be clarified, so it is very clear to the reader which datasets are included in this 'many labs' collaboration (e.g. see Background). In the data repository the index currently refers to the different datasets from Steingroever as unpublished and in prep. This is, I believe, not consistent with the naming of these studies in Table 1. From Table 1 it is not completely clear which reference belongs to which Steingroever dataset/reference (e.g. the Table mentions two unpublished datasets from Steingroever, but only one is mentioned in the reference list?). Also, the reference list mentions a set of Steingroever papers that do not seem to be referred to in the text. In sum, it would be helpful to check and align references between text, table, and index.

2. the authors included an older adults' sample in this dataset (Wood et al.). Is this a healthy older-adult sample? To my knowledge, the Wood study describes a young and older adult age group (18-34; 65-88 years) that differ in decision strategy. Given that this population seems quite different, it might be informative to point this out by, for instance, adding age-ranges to Table 1. Or, if possible, even indicate in the deposited data what are the younger/older subjects for this study including such a wide age range.