

**NAME/LOGO OF THE ORGANIZATION THAT ORDERED THIS REPORT
HAS BEEN DELETED TO COMPLY WITH DATA PROTECTION**

Pre-submission Review Report

**An Award-Winning Organization Committed to Supporting the Research Community
across the World**

Message from the Peer Reviewer



Thank you for choosing **Enago** to assist you in peer reviewing. We have carefully reviewed your manuscript and have performed a comprehensive evaluation of your manuscript. Based on this evaluation, we have prepared this report that gives you an assessment of your paper, along with a list of problem areas and suggested revisions organized in an order of priority, to minimize chances of journal rejection.

Note: Please provide an indepth technical review of the manuscript and analyze the current research status of the paper in comparison to existing research developments in similar field. In case you find **English language issues** in the paper that affects the overall readability, please mention it in the “Manuscript Quality” section. Please make your best attempt to provide comments related to the technical aspects of the study as this will help the author improve the manuscript according to your suggestions.

Manuscript Details

Assignment Code [REDACTED] Total Word Count 6518

Manuscript Title [REDACTED]

Detailed Review of Each Section

○ Title Page

The title reflects the theme of the manuscript; however, it does not illuminate what makes the study significant. It does not anticipate that the work provides preliminary evidence for questioning the Truth Effect to some extent as a well-replicated (“very robust”) principle. The title may give the impression that the article is just another research about the correlation between truth and belongingness, possibly affecting interest for publication.

The following alternatives are suggested:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The above suggestions are just some ideas but indicate the direction to what could work better in favor of the presentation of the article.

○ Abstract

The size of the Abstract is within the standard word count. It focuses namely on the methods, procedures, and results, but the purpose of the article is not explicit. A similar problem is noted in the case of the conclusion. It is not properly outlined. Also, several aspects related to sentence structure, syntax, wording, clarity, format, and inclusion of keywords need to be corrected.

1) Purpose of the article

The only statement in the Abstract that brings the reader closer to the idea of a purpose in the article is the following: “However, no study has considered the interaction of the Truth Effect with degree of belonging to the perceived source of the repeated statements.”

The purpose of the article and/or the hypothesis that motivates the article should be expressly presented, albeit in a succinct way.

2) Conclusion of the article

A recount with the findings of the study is given at the end of the Abstract. Apparently, it is assumed to serve as a conclusion, but it is not. A brief description of what the results mean for the research needs to be included.

3) Sentence structure/syntax/wording

The first paragraph of the Abstract reads: “The “Truth Effect”, repeating a statement 3 times over a period of a month resulting in a significant increase in perceived validity of the statement, is a robust effect with over 51 studies having validation. However, no study has considered the interaction of the Truth Effect with degree of belonging to the perceived source of the repeated statements.”

Alternative text to the above paragraph: “According to the Truth Effect, repeating a statement three times over a period of a month results in a significant increase in the perceived validity of the statement. The Truth Effect is a robust criterion with over 51 studies that confirm its reliability. However, no study has considered the interaction of the Truth Effect with different degrees of group belonging based on a perceived source for the repetition process.”

4) Clarity

The third sentence of the first paragraph reads: “Study designed as a factorial study using 3 variables: degree of belonging and group as between subject’s independent variables, repetition as a repeated measure within subject’s independent variable, and degree of perceived truth as the dependent variable.”

The grammar, style, and contents are confusing. The first line should read: “The present study has been designed as a factorial study using three variables...” The phrase that follows “degree of belonging and group as between subject’s independent variables...” is imprecise. “Degree of belonging and group” gives us to understand as if there were two categories -1) degree of belonging and 2) group belonging-. The expression “as between”, on the other hand, is not appropriate since the elements involved (“subject’s independent variables”) are assumed to be more than two. Also, the use of synonyms to improve reading flow is important, e.g., “repetition as a repeated measure” has the following alternatives: “repetition as a recurring/recurrent measure” or “repetition as a reiterative measure”. It is observed too that in many cases articles are omitted in the narrative, e.g., “degree of belonging” instead of “a degree of belonging”, or “degree of perceived truth” instead of “a degree of perceived truth”.

5) Format

The Abstract shows a different font (Calibri 12 pt) than the rest of the article (Times New Roman 12 pt). Some sentences in the Abstract are in a different size: Calibri 10 pt. The font and size should be the same for all the parts of the manuscript (usually Times New Roman 12), except in the case of footnotes (a minor size of the same font should be used: 10 pt).

6) Keywords – The keywords are missing.

7) Graphic Abstract – The title of the graphic is missing. It should be within the frame of the image.

○ Introduction

The Introduction section is not identified. There is no “Introduction” heading. It is assumed that the section starts on page 4, where the main text begins, and finishes on page 10 before the Methods are introduced. The title of the article is repeated on page 4. This title should be removed, and in its place, the Introduction title should be inserted.

The different statements within the section are correctly referenced and try to explain in detail how the study originated, what are the author's motivation and concerns, the parameters of the study, what was to be expected which the study finally did not show, the novelty of the research, and its distinctive nature. At the end of the section, the purpose of the study is indicated which is basically described in terms of the scope of the analysis. Neither the theoretical nor the material limitations of the research are mentioned in this section. Strengths and limitations are explained in the Discussion section.

Several problems related mainly to fluency, control of the narrative, clarity, grammar, syntactic/semantic errors, personal and non-inclusive language, spelling, and punctuation are present.

Fluency, control of the narrative/punctuation

Page 4 – The first paragraph reads: “The truth will set you free. But what do we know about truth itself? Why is truth so important? The truth in a political investigation. The truth in a national election affecting so many vulnerable populations. The truth as it relates to racism, bigotry, and misogyny. So in a real sense, when is the nature of truth not important to all of us?”

Alternative to the above paragraph: “The truth will set you free. But what do we know about the truth? Why is truth so important? The truth in a political investigation, or a national election (possibly affecting so many vulnerable populations), or the “truth” that lies beneath racism, bigotry, misogyny, for example, conditions our thoughts, beliefs, and behavior. When does the truth turn into something that we cannot trust? Why do we not care more about the real truth?”

Personal pronouns/style

Page 4 - The second paragraph (lines 6 to 10) reads: “If I think that a group of humans are inferior, then I will disdain them. I will try to keep them down. If I think the leader of my political party has been falsely accused by the opposing party, then I will feel anger towards the opposing party. I will try to keep them from harming my political leader. The implications for mankind, of thinking that something is true, is immense.”

Note - In academic writing, impersonal language is required. Personal pronouns/expressions like “I”, “we” (when referred to the authors), “the author/s”, “the present researcher” and similar, with their corresponding possessive adjectives, should be avoided.

Alternative to the above paragraph: “If a group of humans is believed to be inferior in some way, those that consider themselves superior could end up treating that group differently. They could even feel encouraged to treat them with disdain. If the leader of a political party is falsely accused of misconduct by the opposing party, the followers of that leader may feel entitled to express their anger towards those that they believe to be responsible. The implications for mankind of thinking that something is true when it is not are immense.”

Grammatical and semantic errors/clarity

Page 5 – The last statement of the second paragraph reads – “We could ask ourselves were humans ever really evolutionary meant to hear tens of repeated statements daily?”

Alternative to the above paragraph: “We could ask ourselves if, from an evolutionary perspective, humans are really apt to hear tens of repeated statements daily.”

Syntactic and grammatical errors/style

Page 5 - The fourth paragraph reads: “Whomever or whatever we attach to, we ascribe more truth, more validity to, changing our sense of reality. Conversely, whomever or whatever we are detached to, we ascribe less truth, less validity to, changing our sense of reality.”

Alternative to the above paragraph: “Whoever or whatever we attach to is relevant since we tend to ascribe to certain persons and things more truth, more validity, and such behavior can change our sense of reality. Conversely, whoever or whatever we are detached to can also vary our sense of truth and lead us to limit or reduce its value, validity, and capacity to modify our sense of reality.”

Non-inclusive language/style/punctuation

Page 7 – The first paragraph reads: “An adolescent individuates from his family of origin, and belongs to his peer group in the practice and experimentation sub phase. Belonging less to his family of origin, the adolescent questions their parent’s guidance, and believes his peer group instead. We see this change again during the consolidated sense of self sub phase, when an adult child may return to belong with the family of origin and again ascribes more truth to the older generation (Arnett, 2016; Esman, 1980; Jj Arnett, 2000)”

Note - In academic writing, it is required inclusive language, that is, to avoid expressions that may imply gender bias, sexist, racist, or other prejudiced attitudes towards a particular group of people.

Alternative to the above paragraph: “An adolescent individuates from his or her family and tries to belong to a peer group in the practice and experimentation sub-phase. Feeling less influenced by the family of origin, adolescents question their parent’s guidance and believe instead in those of their peer group. We see this change again during the consolidated sense of self sub-phase, when an adult child may return to the family of origin and again ascribes more truth to the older generation (Arnett, 2016; Esman, 1980; Jj Arnett, 2000).”

Consistency

Page 8, second paragraph: The figures in this paragraph are shown in two different ways. It can be used the form “millions” or show the figures in numbers, but the preferred form should be used in all cases. There are punctuation errors in this paragraph too.

Control of the narrative/semantics

Page 9 - The last paragraph reads: “Since the “Truth Effect” is such a robust effect, we thought that a new study exploring the interaction of the Repetition Effect and the Belonging effect could shed some light on a number of questions. When you have differing levels of belonging to a group, does the Repetition Effect remain constant when you hear ambiguous statements assuming to have originated from the group? Could a new study give us some clue as to which effect, Belonging or Truth, is more dominate?”

Alternative to the above paragraph: “Since the Truth Effect is such a robust effect, a new study exploring the interaction of the Repetition Effect and the Belonging Effect could shed some light on a number of questions. Some of those questions are: does the Repetition Effect remain constant when different levels of belonging are evident and ambiguous statements assumed to have been originated from the group are heard? Could a new study give us some clue as to which effect (Belonging Effect or Truth Effect) is more dominant?”

Impersonal language/clarity

Page 10 – The second paragraph, an important passage that refers to the expectations of the study, requires to be reformulated in a more simple, clear way, using impersonal language.

Spelling, semantic, and grammar errors/punctuation – These types of errors should be checked throughout the section. There are spelling, semantic, and grammar mistakes: “Meta – Analysis” instead of “meta-analysis”, “American” instead of “Americans”, “attach” instead of “attachment”, “sub phase” instead of “sub-phase”, “attributes is” instead of “attributes are”, and others. Many terms are repeated several times. Definite and

indefinite articles are frequently omitted. There are also several cases of a space before a full stop. No space before a period should be put.

The examples given above are just some of the many found.

○ **Methods**

The section dedicated to the methods shows its heading in the singular (“Method”). Since different procedures are described it is more accurate to name it in the plural form. The section is organized in six subsections: “Design”; a second subsection about the demographic groups studied which is not duly labeled; “Subjects”; “Measures”; “Procedures”; and “Analytical Procedures”. The subsection under the heading “Procedures” refers to the material strategies and processes performed, therefore it should be appropriately identified as “Material Procedures” in contrast to the “Analytical Procedures” subsection.

The description of the techniques and practices used seems appropriate and in accordance with the standard routines established for the ethical treatment of individual data and permission from volunteers in related human-subject studies.

In the subsection “Design”, it is mentioned that the study used “4 variables” which is inconsistent with what was announced in the Abstract which indicated 3 variables. The use of articles is omitted frequently, and some grammar errors can be noticed. Examples of both problems: “Present study designed as...” instead of “The present study is designed as...”.

The subsection where the demographic groups are described contains two different font types and sizes. This subsection has no heading. It seems logical to label it “Groups”.

The “Subjects” subsection shows some grammatical errors, e.g., “The sample of participants for the data analysis of the quantitative components were from classrooms...” (the correct form of the verb in this sentence should be “was”).

The “Measures” subsection contains omission of articles, as previously noted, and unnecessary repetition of terms. E.g., “Random group source was randomly generated...” instead of, for instance, “A random group source was aleatorily generated...” It also contains a reference to the author which should be eliminated following the standard impersonal language guideline.

In the (Material) “Procedures” subsection, the same mistakes continue, and it is also observed an inconsistent use of tenses and lack of clarity. Example: “The instructor unrelated to the current project handed the student the paper survey to the student and asks...”. Two different tenses are used in the same sentence to describe the actions of the same person in the same context. Another example: “After all students copied the random number they are asked to fill out the paper survey.”

More grammar/clarity issues: “All surveys were then collected. Each time in classroom subjects took a consecutive survey they were given a dollar bill for each survey on the last day of class.”

Suggested alternative: “All surveys were then collected. In-classroom students were given on the last day of class a dollar bill for each survey that they filled out.”

The last paragraph of the “Procedures” subsection is misleading. It starts mentioning again that in-classroom subjects were paid on the last day of class, but it refers to “compensation” (which may be confused with the points compensation described previously for other groups of volunteers). The paragraph also mentions the

“Qualtrks surveys”, associated with the students that did the surveys online, making it more appropriate to relocate this text where the online survey process is described (last paragraph of page 13/first paragraph of page 14).

The last paragraph of the “Analytical Procedures” subsection should be made clearer. It is understood that it contains technical language, but the sentence structure should not be difficult to read.

○ Results

The results are duly exhibited and, in general, well organized from a structural and visual point of view. However, the section displays the kind of shortcomings that have been pointed out in different parts of the manuscript. This time, it is opacity and vagueness in the wording and sentence construction that stand out, harming understanding.

The section includes one table and two figures with labels that illustrate conveniently what they represent. Table 1 is self-explanatory while Figures 1 and 2 count on complementary clarification in the section. It has been noted that Figure 1 is slightly different from the one displayed as Graphic Abstract on page 3. Consistency is recommended.

In order to reinforce the results and enhance the appearance of the presentation, it is also recommended to add supplementary graphical exhibits.

All data collected seems reliable and compatible with the methods.

Example of problems with wording/sentence construction: “There were approximately three times as many high belonging Democrat and Christian participants than low belonging Democrat and Christian participants (Table XX). There were approximately twice as many low belonging Asians participants (n=27) than high belonging Asian participants (n=14). The number of neutral belonging participants was the same for the Democrat, Christian, and Asian groups (n=3 for each group).”

Alternative to the above: “The results referred to the High Belonging level in the case of Democrat and Christian participants were three times those of the Low Belonging level in the same group categories. (Table 1). The Low Belonging level for Asian participants (n=27) was twice approximately the High Belonging level for Asian participants (n=14). The number of Neutral Belonging participants was the same for the Democrat, Christian, and Asian groups (n=3) for each group.”

It should be paid attention to the corrections in the alternative paragraph regarding spelling, syntax, and punctuation, as well as consistency (not seen in several parts of the manuscript) in the use of capital letters and unnecessary quotation marks to identify the different degrees of belonging.

○ Discussion

The Discussion section tries to reason the findings as a preamble of the conclusion, but the language and style are awkward, and it demands effort on behalf of the reader to grasp what is meant. Grammatical mistakes and omissions are constant. This section includes a subsection titled “Strengths and Limitations”.

Examples of problems:

Page 17 - The first and second paragraphs read: “How humans ascribe truth to a statement has importance to all of us. How one thinks; racist, culturally centralist, misogynistic, bigotries, and prejudicial thoughts deeply affects each of us, and our social groups (Bacon, May, & Charlesford, 2020; Williams, C. & Parrott, 2012).

We found something interesting in our present study that begs further research. We found evidence the Belonging Effect with low belonging, interacting with the Truth Effect, can put the Truth Effect into reverse. At first unbelievable because of the Truth Effect's robustness (Dechêne, Stahl, Hansen, & Wänke, 2009c), forcing the usual upwards trajectory of the Truth Effect validity ratings into the ground and below seems improbable."

Alternative text: "How one thinks about certain things and others may be determined sometimes by prejudicial thoughts deeply rooted in each of us and in our social groups (Bacon, May, & Charlesford, 2020; Williams, C. & Parrott, 2012).

The present study revealed interesting aspects that beg further research. Evidence was found of a particular interacting correlation between truth and some degrees of belonging to a group. This evidence seems contrary to what could have been expected according to the Truth Effect. In the context of this research, the so-called Truth Effect has been contrasted with what has been denominated the Belonging Effect, and the findings have shown that a Low Belonging level could put the Truth Effect into reverse. This conclusion may be considered controversial, in principle, because of the Truth Effect's robustness reputation and usual upwards trajectory (Dechêne, Stahl, Hansen, & Wänke, 2009c)."

Another example. Page 18 – The first paragraph: "The more statements I hear from a low belonging group, the less I believe them. This is not case of disbelieving an obvious lie from an opposing group. These are ambiguous, normative statements I believe less over time from a low belonging group."

The first statement of the paragraph would need to be clarified because the way it is written suggests that the low effect in belief was caused by the number of statements heard ("the more statements I hear"), not by the number of repetitions of certain statements. Is this so? Also, the sentence affirms that statements are heard "from" a low belonging group, which creates doubts about how to interpret this. Is the subject sure (he has evidence) that the repetition of the statements comes from participants of the low-belonging group, or does the subject just presumes/believes that? The second alternative is what has been given to understand previously: that the repetition is "assumed" to be generated from the group (page 9 of the manuscript) in which case the above statement needs to be rephrased. These are relevant nuances that make a difference in the findings and their interpretation.

The second and third statements of the same paragraph are obscure; it is not easy to follow which is said.

Personal language should be avoided. The use of "I" is inappropriate.

In the subsection "Strengths and Limitations" grammatical errors are noticed.

○ Conclusion

The conclusion is, perhaps, the weakest part of the manuscript. The overarching claims that support the results and the implications of the research are not exposed neatly and effectively.

The line of argument does not adhere to a logical scheme to review the hypothesis of the study, the methodology and steps that were taken to reach the findings, and a final evaluation of the results achieved. On the other hand, although stress is put on the potential of the study, and some paths that future research could pursue are provided, these are matters that must be better elaborated because of the significance of the research.

The section starts stating key concerns connected with the nature of truth and belongingness. It continues highlighting the benefit of CBT, and it introduces subsequently a paragraph through which the relevance of

studying what affects truth is linked with the wisdom of the founding fathers (turning the article into a somewhat more parochial piece). Proposals for future investigation are then suggested without a clear characterization, mixing experimental research that evokes the field of neuroscience with social psychology and group attachment/belonging exploration, while also linking these contexts with the field of critical thinking, a concept not exclusively studied by science. The suggestions presented need to be refined.

The section also lists some disadvantages and limitations of the study. It is more reasonable to have them in the Discussion section and to resume them concisely in the Conclusion section.

The themes and ideas, in general, are not fluidly tied or solidly asserted, giving the impression that the section lacks the unity and weight that it should have. Below some samples of texts with problems:

Page 19 - The first paragraph reads: "Is belonging bad? Of course not. It is in our nature to belong as many studies has shown. But to bind and be blind, we humans are vulnerable to mistruths. How many truths have we heard that were lies? How many rejected thoughts were true? Might we have an obligation to make others aware of this phenomena?"

The last question of the above passage distances the article from the purpose of the research. The question is connected with a moral issue that concerns truth, but the article is not the space to address it. It is a philosophical question that exceeds the intention of the paper. The paper focuses on the premise that group belonging influences truth; on the nexus between truth and belongingness based on certain methodological grounds that finally result in important unexpected consequences; and on the fact that such results justify further investigation.

Alternative text to the above paragraph:

"Is belonging to a group something we should avoid? Does it necessarily result in negative consequences? Of course not. Belongingness is in our nature as many studies have shown. But to bind and to be blind about our affinities and affections are two different things, and we humans are vulnerable to mistruths in many peculiar ways. This is a phenomenon that poses many questions."

Page 20 - The second paragraph reads: "Future research should answer the many questions that arise from the present study. Are the brain regions, deactivated specific to critical thinking and negative emotions in Bartels study of Love attachment (Bartels & Zeki, 2004), the same for high belonging to other attachments like groups, objects, and ideas? Could we measure with a FMRI or MEG the attachment to a group, person, object, or idea by the degree of deactivation of critical thinking, and unpleasant feeling states when presented with a stimulus?"

This passage exemplifies a common difficulty in this section: a load of information for which no introduction or supplementary reasoning is offered. It should not be presupposed that because the article is destined namely to scholars in the field, the rules of proper justification in academic writing can be obviated.

It is recommended that the Conclusion is rewritten entirely.

○ References

Citation style for both the in-text citations used and the reference list is compatible with APA style. The literature that informs the different parts of the manuscript is shown with the corresponding in-text citation. The number of references, however, is excessive. An average of thirty references is considered a good number for an academic paper of 7,000 words. More references can be included, but over fifty is a disproportionate number for an article under 10,000 words. The manuscript has 6,518 words and a list of 63 references. This list is even

longer since some in-text citations have not been duly included in the Reference list. It is required to reduce the number of references. The sources of a research paper should be the latest, ideally two or three years old. In any case, and depending on the field of research, no older than five years.

On page 5, at the end of the third paragraph, two separate in-text citations are introduced: (Henkel & Mattson, 2011) (Brashier, Eliseev, & Marsh, 2020). They should be corrected to: (Brashier, Eliseev & Marsh, 2020; Henkel & Mattson, 2011). Different authors/dates should be within the same set of parentheses and the names alphabetically ordered. In-text citations should be revised accordingly. On page 6, last paragraph, the reference is duplicated.

Once the number of references is reduced, the final list of References must reflect complete information of all in-text citations used in the body of the manuscript. Also, those works that result not referenced in the body of the manuscript should not appear on the Reference list.

○ **Figures**

The manuscript includes two figures. They are adequately titled, and they display the findings intuitively, though additional explanations are required to appreciate plainly certain characteristics. These explanations are presented, together with each figure, in the Results section. The figures' data and the explanations are consistent with the principles of the study.

In order to enrich the article and improve the impact of the results, it is recommended to add new figure/s.

○ **Tables**

The manuscript includes one table. It is self-explanatory, correctly labeled and it clearly represents the scope of the study design. It is recommended to consider additional exhibits. For instance, a chart with the particular statements that were selected to be repeated during the surveys, according to what is mentioned in point 2. of the Measures section, could be a good addition.

○ **Style**

Several style problems have been detected that compromise readability, comprehension, and the impact of the study. The priority aspects concern clarity, the flow of ideas, argumentation content and techniques, and different structural issues associated with some misunderstanding of grammar rules. All and each of these problems has been examined in great detail in the corresponding sections of this report.

A serious and thorough correction of the writing style is strongly suggested so that the manuscript can have a genuine chance of publication.

Quality of Research

○ **Originality of research [Rating: Good]**

The research seems original in its nature, which makes it important to the field and researchers. It is a scientifically oriented preliminary approach that promises further examination and new different connected ways of exploration.

The study demonstrates what appears to be unprecedented qualities of the Truth Effect in interaction with different degrees of belongingness in different types of social groups. It proposes a fresh perspective and solid reasons to continue investigation, including alternate routes to evaluate the correlation between group-belonging and the Truth Effect, their levels of mutual influence, and their implications.

- **Significance to field [Rating: Good]**
Evidence that seems to contradict the conventional status of a long-standing alleged principle always constitutes captivating and provoking material for analysis and research in any academic area. In this case, the subject of the research also matters to us all: truth and its effects. The presence or absence of truth, and what we assume as such, alters deeply, for better or worse, our forms of coexistence and conviviality. How truth is perceived and interpreted, and more distinctly, how it is misrepresented or misconstrued, leading to improper beliefs and courses of action, aggregates further significance to the theme. The basic hypothesis of the study consisted of verifying the performance of the Truth Effect and its Repetition Effect in contrast with degrees of group-belonging to finally report on the resulting Belonging Effect. The experiment produced unpredicted outcomes that stimulate further experimental investigation, placing the study as a contribution to social psychology and, in general, to the study of truth.
- **Soundness of study design [Rating: Good]**
The methods and data are fairly organized and presented. No barrier or obstacle is appreciated that could not allow other researchers to reproduce the procedures and methods of the study following their structure and planning.
- **Ethical soundness [Rating: Good]**
The basic guidelines seem to have been duly complied with according to what is confirmed in the manuscript. The study was described to the participants as research of “unusual sources of information”. Consent forms to all the subjects that filled out the different surveys (in-person or online) were distributed and collected. The participants were informed that no personal data would be kept.
- **Sufficiency of data analysis [Rating: Good]**
The article is well and sufficiently supported by robust data obtained from updated empirical studies and other pertinent literature.
- **Overall Rating [Rating: Good]**
The study is innovative in its line of research; it is worthy for researchers, especially in the field of social sciences and humanities; and it aims at future investigation.

Manuscript Quality

- **Clarity of presentation [Rating: Poor]**
As it has been commented comprehensively in this report, insufficient clarity and fluency, and fundamental complications with the writing style, are evidenced in the manuscript. These weaknesses do not demean the value and quality of the research, but they damage seriously the opportunities for publication.

The limitations mentioned have been observed throughout the manuscript. They are due to a lack of precision and difficulties to express certain ideas. Irregular use of grammar and syntax is one of the main causes.

An overall revision and significant editing are required before the manuscript is submitted for publication.
- **Organization and Structure [Rating: Poor]**
The structure of the different parts and elements of the article are, in principle, satisfactory; however, the organization of a great part of the contents and, in some cases, its distribution in some sections of the

manuscript, is inadequate or incomplete. The Abstract, the Discussion, and the Conclusion sections are the ones with more problems.

In the Abstract, a clear indication of the purpose and the conclusions of the article is missing. Also missing are the keywords. The Graphic Abstract has no title within its frame.

The Discussion and the Conclusion sections, as it has been noted in the corresponding fields of this report, must be reworked to address the several issues detailed.

Also, it has been recommended to include additional exhibits/data in the Results section.

There are also corrections to be made concerning some missing or inaccurate headings in the Introduction section and in some of the Methods subsections, as commented already.

○ **Evidence supports [Rating: Fair]**

The sources of evidence that support the research cover a variety of publication periods, in some cases, periods of more than twenty years, though the great majority of them cover very recent studies, including research papers published this year. The volume of works, however, is exaggerated. It is recommended a substantial reduction of the references for the reasons contemplated in the Reference section of this report.

○ **Adequacy of the literature review [Rating: Fair/Poor]**

Although the literature could be considered adequate in terms of compatibility with the subject of the manuscript, the suitability of the sources in academic publishing requires a reasonable extension and antiquity of the references used as well. Also, it requires conformity to basic rules of citation. There are errors and discrepancies indicated in the Reference section that must be rectified.

○ **Overall Rating [Rating: Poor]**

The writing style and the methodological aspects remarked make it necessary that the manuscript is carefully edited.

Next Steps

The following are the three most important improvements that the author needs to make.

- Improve the writing style and correct grammar/syntax/spelling errors.
- Rewrite the Abstract, the Discussion, and the Conclusion sections.
- Follow the suggestions indicated in the References section.

The following are the three most important strengths of this paper which the author should not lose in the process of revision.

- The unexpected disparities revealed by the study as a consequence of testing the Truth Effect against different degrees of social group-belonging, which resulted in preliminary evidence to question certain assumptions.
- The valuable venues that the study opens to interdisciplinary inquiry and future research in new experimental scenarios.
- The motivation to improve our knowledge and awareness of the peculiar nuances of the concept of truth.

Current Manuscript Status and Recommendation

- Your manuscript should be rewritten in line with the suggestions before submission for publication.
Recommendation: NA
 - Overall flow of the manuscript and writing style should be corrected before publication.
Recommendation: See Advance Editing
-