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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewers,

We thank you all for your time and insightful comments on our submission to Research Integrity and Peer Review. Below, we include a summary of what we have changed based on your feedback, and we are grateful for the chance to improve the quality of our submission. Our changes are also highlighted in orange in the re-submission.

Based on the editor’s comments, we have restructured and re-written our abstract to follow the recommendations and style of the journal.

Based on the overall comments highlighted by the editor we have:

1. Removed numbering from subtitles;
2. Used the guidelines from CHERRIES to structure the methods section of our submission and add missing information requested by both the editor and the reviewers;
3. Better-organized and separated the results and discussions of the results. The qualitative results presentation analysis has been supplemented with quotes, and the quantitative results have been complemented with the number of respondents and percentages for more transparency of these results. The parts of the results that were more about discussing and reasoning have been moved to the new discussion section. The discussion section now also presents the reasoning from the previous paper version about the results, with additional references to other relevant research, as well as limitations and future work. Additionally we have addressed other comments made by the editor on this section (points B and C);
4. Added the discussions on sample size to the methods section;

5. Added a sentence to the submission text making clear that the reviewer is quite correct and, during the analysis, we did correct the category of question to which the participants were responding (reviewer/author perspective) where it was clearly apparent that they had responded as reviewer when they were supposed to be thinking as an author.

6. Our answers are indeed sorted per category and not per participant. While we see how that can be potentially useful in some cases, we provide our raw data for this exact reason and hope our readers will make use of our OSF repository should they want to get more from our data. We also understand that it can possibly puzzle readers that a person’s comment is only taken into account if two of the coders reading the raw data put it in the same category. However, this was done in accordance with our initial planning and follows usual methods applied in the codebook for qualitative data analysis. By ensuring that at least two coders agree that a specific comment should be in a category, we make sure to reduce the number of false positives we would get. We believe it is better to underestimate in this case than to overestimate. Again, however, since our raw data is available on the OSF repository, readers are strongly encouraged to try a different analysis with a different angle. We have checked our data/paper for mistakes but could not find the error mentioned by the editor. It appears that “17” only appears in our data as being the number of participants in a category as per a single coder, but not two. We therefore think that we did not make a mistake in our manuscript, but are happy to be shown otherwise; and

7. We have added labels in our figures to make sure the likert scales are correctly interpreted.

In addition to these, we have addressed the following points:

1. [R1,R2] Added the dates of the survey and all missing information mentioned by R2 (see previous response with the CHERRIES structure);

2. [R1] Have made our discussion of the findings in other contexts clearer;

3. [R2] Tidying the results/discussions section (see previous points on the editor’s comments);

4. [R2] We have added the response rate if we were to not consider the social media advertising, but we cannot know how many people replied because they received an email;

5. [R2] We have added the denominators (30) in all our text;

6. [R2] We have added some quotes in our qualitative data analysis and report; and

7. [R3] We have expanded on our discussions and implications for a larger community than alt.chi.

There are a few minor points that we would like to rebut.
1. The link to the data and figures should not be in the abstract. We respectfully disagree. In an era when automated text-analysis of scientific communication is often used, provided link to data/materials in the abstract is important as it is easy to parse. It is actually recommended by many researchers (e.g., [A]) and current practice in many different venues (see e.g., papers by the first author of this manuscript [B]).

2. We considered making the “required” questions of the survey optional but we believe that we should share the survey as it was administered for transparency reasons and to avoid potential misunderstanding from future readers.

3. We do not include full responses to the survey in the paper directly, but the results section has been clarified with some illustrative quotes. We agree with R1 that reproducibility and transparency should always be put forward, and this is exactly the reason we shared our raw and analyzed data. We argue that adding too many direct quotes to the gathered data would clutter the manuscript and make it less easy to read.
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