# Editor feedback

I have now read your revised manuscript. I appreciate your careful attention to the concerns the reviewers and I raised. I am happy to provisionally accept your manuscript for publication.

|  |
| --- |
| Wonderful. Thank you for handling our manuscript. |

Apostrophes. EDC’s should be EDCs. M’s should be Ms. SD’s should be SDs. Hedge’s g should be Hedges’ g.

|  |
| --- |
| Thank you for catching this. We have fixed all cases. |

on p. 8 should dozen be dozens?

|  |
| --- |
| Correct. This is fixed now. |

The Durgin reference in the discussion should be Durgin et al.

|  |
| --- |
| Fixed. |

The forest plot could use some column headers.

|  |
| --- |
| Great idea. We added two column headers. |

In some cases you have obtained effect sizes directly but in other cases you compute them indirectly or infer them. Can you provide the ns for direct and indirect? Presumably it doesn’t moderate the findings?

|  |
| --- |
| In the updated manuscript (p. 14), we now specify how often we used each approach to calculating effect sizes.  You are correct that this does not moderate the findings. The cluster-robust F-value for the test of moderation was 0.53 (*p* = .75). |

Can you briefly provide a little more information in the main text about the study that is now in the supplement? Otherwise, I worry that nobody will ever discover it.

|  |
| --- |
| This is now added on p. 29 |

The supplement study needs a reference list.

|  |
| --- |
| Done. |