

Table of contents

Editor's note/overview.....	2
Reviewers' comments.....	2
Potential.....	2
Theoretical Strength, Justification, Structure and Coherence.....	3
Style/form.....	3
Decision.....	3
Reviewers' letters.....	4
Reviewer #2's letter.....	5
Reviewer #10a's letter.....	6
Theoretical strength.....	6
Structure and integration.....	6
Style.....	7
Reviewer #16's letter.....	7
Potential.....	7
Theoretical contribution.....	7
Structure & Coherence.....	7
Form.....	7

Editor's note/overview

Your manuscript brings forth an interesting theoretical potential and has significantly improved since its last review. The main criticisms pertaining to the previous iteration have been addressed in a satisfactory fashion and your article will definitely be acceptable for publishing.

Some aspects still need refinement. Namely, it would be better to highlight the link between your contribution and interpersonal/intergroup relations in a more manifest/apparent way.

Overall, the paper is very well explained, although I did find it somewhat long at times. For example, you present a very detailed review of the Tversky and Kahneman paper (including an exact description of their results), and I'm not sure all of this information is necessary. Also, if correlations are presented in a table, their statistics do not necessarily have to be repeated in the text of the paper. These might be ways in which the length of your paper could be reduced.

Reviewers' comments

Potential

Reviewers generally agreed that the level of polish you applied to your manuscript now makes it a worthwhile addition that is insightful and pleasant to read. Good work! Reviewer #16 did raise an issue regarding the link between your contribution and the JIRIRI's core subject, however:

Nevertheless, I still have trouble seeing how the article falls into the field of Interpersonal relations, intergroup relations and identity. Although, the author puts much more emphasize on interpersonal relationships (within the literature section and description of materials), they are not the topic of the article, rather a marginal note. The main variables are (1) consistent decision making (but it's implications on interpersonal relationships are not addressed), (2) intelligence and personality (I assume they are conceptually distinct from identity?).

I wanted to highlight this issue, as it was one of the three main points of contention in the previous review of your manuscript. While you did add the link with interpersonal relationships, I indeed felt like it was put there a bit tentatively. When I read your article, I was enthusiastically looking for a clear statement on identity, interpersonal or intergroup relations, and I found myself a bit in the dark when I finished reading. I ran a keyword search onto your manuscript and found no traces except the

aforementioned link with interpersonal relationships on page eight. This link does not seem to have been emphasized much, nor does it come back in the introduction or conclusion, and, as such, is easy to overlook. If possible, I would suggest trying to highlight that link (and perhaps it could be hypothesized that subjective well-being could also be related to interpersonal relations, or to one's own identity) so that the reader feels your article, as a whole, integrates smoothly into our journal.

Theoretical Strength, Justification, Structure and Coherence

Reviewers typically praised the theoretical strength and argumentation in the your revised manuscript. Reviewer #10a and #16 expressed some minor concerns, but were otherwise cautiously optimistic. Reviewer #10a also mentioned that you should add a few concrete suggestions on how to address your sampling issues. This will enable future research to work around the problems you experienced and build onto your findings more easily, thus raising the value of your contribution.

Style/form

Remaining criticisms are rather minor and pertain to the use of “language bias” (namely, using gender-specific pronouns) and some remaining instances of slang. See the reviewers' reports and annotations for more details.

The subtitles used throughout are very helpful to the reader, and I would suggest adding a subtitle for your hypothesis section, as this is one of the most important sections of your paper.

Your Table 1 and Table 4 are somewhat unclear. I did not know what means and SDs Table 1 was referring to. Similarly, I did not understand what the Tolerance value means in Table 4. Also, check the formatting in Table 2, as it is difficult to read as it is. I also found the description of the decision making task in the materials section somewhat unclear. It might need to be re-worked to clarify exactly how this variable was measured.

Decision

Your article is **accepted with minor corrections requested**. In addition to the stylistic corrections, I would suggest strengthening/emphasizing the link with identity, intergroup relations or interpersonal relations.

Cheers,

The editor for manuscript 2009-12

Reviewers' letters

Provided for your convenience, left unmodified.

Reviewer #2's letter

Suggestion: reject with suggestion to resubmit. The author does not provide descriptions for items within the results sections in Appendix 1, making it difficult to attribute data to supported text.

The discussion section does not provide adequate detail and does not extensively explain all articles and correlations being tested (variance, etc should be given for each correlation and item), thus, the strength of the conclusions being made is hindered. Data should be cited more frequently to support ideas.

The level of writing should be improved: use of first person should be avoided; use of slang should be avoided; more formal wording and a higher level of language should be employed.

Overall, the ideas, hypothesis, and method of the study are interesting and well done. However, stronger correlations and conclusions can be drawn (there seems to be a great deal of data available for analysis although it does not show up in the discussion section).

More detailed suggestions on how further studies could be improved should be included in the discussion (why wasn't there a high correlation, what do you think led to this, how can this be improved?).

The article could be improved to a higher level. Although the historical and background research sections present the topic of the study quite well, there are some areas of the article, namely the methods and discussion sections, which could be improved.

The author uses first person in some areas of the article, and a higher level of formality in the writing is sometimes lacking.

The author should consider editing the article for grammar, spelling, and should employ a more formal writing style, as numerous errors occur throughout the article. In some areas it reflects more as a course submission than a journal submission. Also, repetition of words in certain areas (such as in the abstract, as well as throughout the paper).

The interpretation of the results could be elevated slightly, with greater reference to correlation, validity, and what tools were used in determining these. Example, on page 25 "positive, yet non-significant", why is it not significant even though there is a positive correlation?

Future improvements to the test itself could also be added upon.

Reviewer #10a's letter

This is an interesting and insightful research paper, which explores the relationship between intellectual abilities and personality in predicting intelligent behaviours. I am confident that this paper merits publication in the journal, although I would like to make some suggestions regarding minor corrections, which I believe could further strengthen the paper.

Theoretical strength

The paper provides an excellent rationale for studying this topic by outlining findings from relevant previous research in social psychology. Furthermore, the need for further research is well-argued. The inclusion of emotional intelligence in the study makes this a rather ambitious, though integrative and successful, study – so it was a good decision to include this, I feel.

A specific point relating to the literature review at the beginning – just before the ‘intelligence and personality’ section you discuss the notion that individuals may engage in apparently non-intelligent behaviour despite being intelligent. This is expressed in a slightly naive manner and in order to strengthen this point I’d suggest the following fantastic book: *The Psychology of Risk* by G.M. Breakwell. I’m certain that this would add further theoretical depth to your argumentation here. If you do not wish to dedicate more space to this possibly trivial point then I suggest that these few sentences are re-written in a more tentative manner.

In the discussion section of the paper, I’d like to see some suggestions regarding sampling issues so that future research can build upon the shortcomings/ limitations of the present research. Just a couple of suggestions would suffice – e.g. what kind of sample would be conducive to more generalisable results? Suggestions regarding appropriate methodologies for studying these topics would make a positive impact on the field given that future researchers will attempt to curb some of the limitations associated with this study.

Structure and integration

The paper is well-written and well-organised. This was impressive given the breadth of information covered in the paper. I think this aspect of the paper is as good as it possibly could be!

Style

I noted that the pronoun 'he' is used instead of 'he/she' or the more general 'they' on a number of occasions. This is not really appropriate in this day and age, and should, therefore, be corrected.

All in all, I would like to recommend this paper for publication in the journal.

Reviewer #16's letter

Potential

The article has improved a lot, especially with respect to structure (the subheadings, for example, are very helpful). Moreover, language, style, and justification are satisfactory. By now, reading the manuscript is easy, as it flows and guides the reader through the topic. I would request only some pettily improvements.

Nevertheless, I still have trouble seeing how the article falls into the field of Interpersonal relations, intergroup relations and identity. Although, the author puts much more emphasize on interpersonal relationships (within the literature section and description of materials), they are not the topic of the article, rather a marginal note. The main variables are (1) consistent decision making (but it's implications on interpersonal relationships are not addressed), (2) intelligence and personality (I assume they are conceptually distinct from identity?).

Theoretical contribution

The manuscript provides a good overview on current literature and derivates interesting hypothesis. The aim of the study is to explain peoples (intelligent) behavior. Although, intelligent behavior is approached in a very normative, maybe unreconstructed way, determinants of behavior are theoretically attractive and worth investigating. The study extends traditional approaches that link intelligence and intelligent behavior by considering non-intellective features such as personality traits.

Structure & Coherence

Very good

Form

There still are a lot of examples for language bias (not all of them are marked)