1. p-curve: independent; can't do an overall.

2. Emily wil send the composite -- with independent p-values for the p-curve analysis

3. Ames: 16-item NPI; new data -- Emily's updating them; need to update everything

4.

R^2: tau and sigma were added for explanation of negative R^2

6. Multilevel methods:

7. Two people independently code everything and calculate agreement

8. Recalculate the accuracy of agreement

9. Type of SE ratings; length of relationship;... (calculate the agreement %)

Length of relationship coding: 99%

Type of SE: 99%

10. Uncorrected eff. sizes for the p-curve analysis

========================================================

1. Brent has high expectations

2. Next Friday

========================================================

1. Irwin Fund

2. Health Insurance Extension

=======================================================

Hello Luyao,

Below I list the things you can do to double check that everything is ready with our paper. If you make any changes, please be sure to use track changes.

First, re-run the analyses using the SAS syntax to make sure I didn't make any mistakes; also double check the agency\_communion excel file with Hunter & Schmidt Analyses. I attached all the files.

\*please note that although there are 2 studies from Ames and Kammrath (2004) that the two studies use the same participants (or at least almost completely overlapping participants), so Ames and Kammrath should only be coded as one sample. It is correct now in the excel file...I just wanted to tell you not to change it, which you probably wouldn't have, just being thorough. :)

Second, please try to estimate how many samples were missing information on amount of time acquainted or mean time acquainted (I need to report this in the reviewer letter). I looked at your file that summarized the studies and it seemed like most authors actually had an estimate of the time acquainted--it just needs to be put on the same metric (i.e., all in days). If you can, then run the acquaintance analysis with a continuous variable. If you can't, that is ok, but I definitely need to quantify why it was not possible for the reviewer letter.

Then the following:

- read through the paper again for grammatical errors or sentences that don't make sense

- make sure I didn't accidentally leave out any constructs from Table 1

- make sure only significant stuff is starred; non-significant results are not starred

- make sure there are no missing references; there are no extra references

- make sure all the references are correct and no components are missing (e.g., the doi)

- make sure all the references are in the correct alphabetical order

- make sure all citations in the paper are correct (dates match the dates in the reference section and that the first time they are cited there is the full citation and after that only et al. -- unless there are more than 5 authors and then there is only et al.)

- all 36 of the primary studies are starred in the references, but only the correct 36 are starred

- double check all tables are labeled correctly when referred to in the paper (VERY IMPORTANT)

- double check numbers in the abstract/paper match those in the tables

- double check any numbers pulled from other papers are also correct

- double check all the numbers in the appendix; make sure we have 168 effect sizes and 36 independent samples in the appendix (i.e., no effect sizes/samples are missing)

-- do you know why I wrote "double check these" for the HAS sample sizes in the appendix?

Thanks! We are almost done!

Best,

Emily