Subject: Gratitude for Your Feedback on Our Preprint

Dear Dr. Kahveci,

We hope this email finds you well. We are writing to express our heartfelt appreciation for your thorough review of our preprint concerning reliability assessments of SPMT. Your perceptive feedback and detailed observations have been incredibly valuable to our research. Regarding your query, we are not sure if our understanding is accurate, so we'd like to consult with you again for your confirmation.

Regarding your first question. Indeed, after reading the relevant articles carefully, we found that we mislabeled the permuted split-half reliability as Monte Carlo split-half you mentioned. The Monte Carlo split-half should be performed as follows:

*First resample with replacement from a single dataset (e.g., 60 trials) to obtain two datasets of the same size as the original (i.e., n trials = 60). Then, calculate the correlation coefficient between these two datasets.*

We tested this way of estimating reliability for a few times and found that this approach indeed results in much higher (or inflated) reliability.

“…reliability values were aggregated across studies using a function intended for regular averaging.” Regarding this question, we used "metafor::aggregate.escalc" to compute a weighted average, with trial counts serving as weighting factor, for the correlation coefficients of each article, instead of a simple average.

The article you suggested are very helpful. We are trying to implement this method to our data so that we can use this method in our next revision. However, we are still looking for R functions that implements this method. If you have seen such functions, please let us know! Your suggestions are highly appreciated.

Once again, we want to express our deepest gratitude for your meticulous evaluation of our paper and your invaluable feedback. Should you have any additional suggestions or insights, we would greatly appreciate your input.

Warm regards,

Zheng Liu and Mengzhen Hu