

# PORTFOLIO

---

ANNA G. B. SEDLACEK  
DEVELOPMENTAL EDITOR  
agbsedlacek@gmail.com | (732) 735-3911  
[www.theacademiac.com](http://www.theacademiac.com)

---

## CONTENTS

RESUME.....	1
MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION (SAMPLE) .....	3
EDITORIAL NOTE (SAMPLE) .....	9

# RESUME

## EDUCATION

---

### Ph.D., Individual Differences and Evolutionary Psychology, 2021

University of Texas at Austin, Psychology Department

Graduate Advisor: David M. Buss, Ph.D.

### B.A., Psychology, *summa cum laude*, 2014

Rutgers University, School of Arts and Sciences Honors Program

## SKILLS, PROFICIENCIES, AND QUALIFICATIONS

---

- ▷ Certificate in Developmental Editing from the University of Washington, 2023
- ▷ Subject matter expertise in psychology, evolutionary theory, and philosophy of science
- ▷ Exceptional aptitude for analyzing and editing persuasive writing, esp. logical consistency and argument structure
- ▷ Knowledge of APA Style
- ▷ Proficient in:
  - ▶ Microsoft Word, PowerPoint, and Excel
  - ▶ Adobe Acrobat
  - ▶ Google Docs, Sheets, and Slides
  - ▶ Inkscape and GIMP (vector and raster images)
  - ▶ Davinci Resolve and Screencast-O-Matic (video recording and editing)

## PUBLICATIONS – AS EDITOR

---

- ▶ Buss, D. M. (2021). *When men behave badly: The hidden roots of sexual deception, harassment, and assault*. Little, Brown Spark.
- ▶ Crosby, C. L., Durkee, P. K., Sedlacek, A. G. B., & Buss, D. M. (2021). Mate availability and sexual disgust. *Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology*, 7(3), 261-280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40750-021-00168-2>
- ▶ Crosby, C. L., Durkee, P. K., Meston, C. M., & Buss, D. M. (2020). Six dimensions of sexual disgust. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 156, 109714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109714>
- ▶ Wyckoff, J. P., Asao, K., & Buss, D. M. (2019). Gossip as an intrasexual competition strategy: Predicting information sharing from potential mate versus competitor mating strategies. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 40(1), 96-104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2018.08.006>
- ▶ Buss, D. M., & von Hippel, W. (2018). Psychological barriers to evolutionary psychology: Ideological bias and coalitional adaptations. *Archives of Scientific Psychology*, 6(1), 148-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/arc0000049>
- ▶ Buss, D. M. (2017). Sexual conflict in human mating. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(4), 307-313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417695559>
- ▶ Wyckoff, J. P., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2016). Direct and indirect aggression tactics as a function of domain-specific self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 92, 135-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.038>

---

## PUBLICATIONS – AS AUTHOR

---

Costello, W., **Sedlacek, A. G. B.**, Durkee, P. K., Crosby, C. L., Hahnel-Peeters, R. K., & Buss, D. M. (in press). Evolutionary psychology hypotheses are testable and falsifiable. *American Psychologist*.

**Sedlacek, A. G. B.** (2022). Natural selection. In T. K. Shackelford (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of evolutionary perspectives on sexual psychology* (Vol. 1: Foundations, pp. 3-20). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108943529>

Crosby, C. L., Durkee, P. K., **Sedlacek, A. G. B.**, & Buss, D. M. (2021). Mate availability and sexual disgust. *Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology*, 7(3), 261-280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40750-021-00168-2>

---

## OTHER EXPERIENCE

---

### University of Texas at Austin

**Teaching Assistant**, Introduction to Psychology (5 semesters, 2015-2021; 700-1600 students)

- ▷ Served as lead editor of semi-weekly short exams: copy- and line-edited 42 questions per week; adjusted questions to balance exam difficulty and topic coverage
- ▷ Managed TA schedules and responsibilities
- ▷ Upon request in the final semester, provided detailed documentation and a recorded lecture for training future TAs to write and edit exam questions

**Assistant Instructor**, Introduction to Psychology (summer 2020; 40 students)

- ▷ Crafted original curriculum, lectures, assignments, and exams
- ▷ Recorded video lectures
- ▷ Moderated discussions on class material
- ▷ Addressed student questions and concerns in office hours
- ▷ Managed last-minute transition to asynchronous online class due to COVID lockdown

**Lead Teaching Assistant**, Introduction to Human Sexuality (4 semesters, 2017-2020; 300-700 students)

- ▷ Designed training document to initiate other TAs across multiple semesters
- ▷ Organized and distributed responsibilities across TA team
- ▷ Created and managed online course material
- ▷ Assembled, administered, and graded quizzes and exams
- ▷ Addressed student questions in office hours and live class chat

**Lab Instructor**, Statistics and Research Design (fall 2018; 13 students)

- ▷ Supervised students in creation of an original research project
- ▷ Edited and gave feedback on final research papers
- ▷ Taught writing techniques, research principles, and APA research paper components and formatting
- ▷ Created lectures for lab section
- ▷ Created and graded weekly homework assignments

# MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION (SAMPLE)

Project Title: [REDACTED]

Writer: [REDACTED]

Editor: Anna Sedlacek

Word Count: 85,765

Date: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED],

I so enjoy reading philosophical treatises on grand topics, and I think your ideas have the potential to provide a logical source of reassurance to many demoralized, nihilistic readers. In the hope of guiding you toward this goal, I've compiled here the most pivotal large-scale concerns and suggestions that occurred to me while reading your manuscript.

Keep in mind that not all of the concerns I raise are necessarily *problems* for your argument. Rather, I believe these points were not adequately explored or supported in the manuscript as it is, and so I think these areas may need to be fortified in future drafts. Think of it like fencing practice: I'm not trying to defeat your arguments when I try to poke holes in them; I'm simply calling attention to an area of weakness that might need to be better defended when it goes up against a real "opponent" — a publisher or your future audience.

Let me know whether this is useful, and if there's anything I can clarify!

Sincerely,  
Anna Sedlacek

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

IDENTIFYING YOUR ARGUMENT	2
POINTS IN NEED OF DEVELOPMENT	3
NARRATIVE & ARGUMENTATIVE STRUCTURE	5
RHETORIC	8
STYLISTIC & STRUCTURAL TRENDS	10
FORMATTING	11

## Identifying Your Argument

- ▷ I think the most defensible version of your argument will be one based on a negative claim about **the epistemic limits of** [REDACTED].
  - ▶ In other words, you'll be logically safest if you start from a position along the lines of epistemic structural realism — acknowledging that science is our best method for predicting and interacting with external reality, and that such an external reality exists; but simultaneously conceding that science probably can't provide any insight into the intrinsic *nature* of that reality.
  - ▶ You'll be in good company if you start from this position, and you'll probably win most atheists and skeptics to your side. But many newcomers to epistemology might be put off by the superficially anti-scientific connotations of the claim about epistemic limits, so you must **cite a lot of authoritative sources in both science and philosophy** to back up the position of epistemic structural realism — in particular, citing mainstream physicists and philosophers of physics directly proposing or endorsing the idea that physics does not provide insight into the intrinsic nature of reality.
  - ▶ As long as you sufficiently ground your skeptical claims about [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (see my thoughts on that in the later section on rhetoric), I think you can then safely argue that [REDACTED] [REDACTED], and then most of the criteria you posit for [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. It seems sensible to defend a version of "[REDACTED]" as long as your claims are limited to [REDACTED], as opposed to making positive claims about [REDACTED]. I think this would tie nicely into your themes of subjectivity and solipsism.
- ▷ On the other hand, if you *do* want to make a **positive claim about** [REDACTED] [REDACTED], then I think you'll be facing an uphill battle: you will need to be even more rigorous in defending each argumentative step and searching for alternative possibilities and counterarguments.
  - ▶ I haven't investigated thoroughly since it's beyond the scope of this manuscript review, but it's quite possible there are solid arguments for some version of [REDACTED] advocating that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. From what little I read of [REDACTED]'s positions, I found the idea surprisingly plausible. But I don't think the arguments and evidence presented so far in your manuscript would be sufficient to support any such form of "real" [REDACTED].

[paragraphs omitted from sample]

## Narrative & Argumentative Structure

- ▷ I think the most effective *structural* approach to allow readers to viscerally understand the illusory nature of [REDACTED] would be to **gradually and systematically disintegrate the legitimacy of increasingly solid-seeming features of** "[REDACTED]" over the course of several chapters.
  - ▶ In one of the later chapters in this draft, you talk about seemingly "real" properties

that feel like they're "out in the world": color, auditory pitch, object boundaries, speed, weight, and distance. This is a good order in which to tackle various aspects of [REDACTED].

- ▽ The first one — color — is one of the most widely recognized qualities that appear "out in the world" but must truly be illusory in some sense. Everyone knows at least one color illusion (e.g., "the dress"), and it's a cliché that intoxicated people will sometimes ask one another "...How do I know that red looks the same way to you as it does to me?" This is a comfortable gateway to dissipating the illusion of [REDACTED].
- ▽ By contrast, the final three properties — speed, weight, and distance — are so apparently "real" that the vast majority of people (myself included) can't really wrap their minds around the idea that they're not "out there." We can only really take it for granted when physicists tell us it's true.
- ▽ If you take the reader on a gradual journey from the plausibly illusory (color) through the seemingly real (object boundaries) to the impossible-to-be-imaginary (time and space), and show how each one in turn either (a) could not be a meaningful feature of external reality or (b) must somehow be endemic to [REDACTED], I think that would be the most effective way to thoroughly shake a reader's belief in [REDACTED].
- ▶ Once you've rocked the epistemic foundations of your audience, your alternative worldview can be planted in fertile ground.
  - ▽ To take myself as an example, [REDACTED].
  - ▽ But once you've fractured the foundations of [REDACTED], some version of [REDACTED] could fit neatly into the cracks, and your audience will be much more open to hearing it if it reassures them that the world can make sense again.
- ▷ I like your idea of replacing the word "[REDACTED]" at some point in the book to focus on the primacy of [REDACTED]. It might be worth dividing your book into two major sections, the first of which is dedicated mainly to establishing the [REDACTED]; the second being an exploration of the implications of [REDACTED].
- ▶ You could clearly mark the distinction between the sections by saying that you're no longer going to make references to [REDACTED] in the second half. But you should also concretely warn readers away from the [REDACTED] implication that [REDACTED]. Not only do I think that claim is less defensible, I think it would also lead to a more bleak outlook for your philosophy; so it's important to ward it off.
- ▶ In explaining and discussing [REDACTED], you might make use of two parallel ideas as explanatory devices: Dan Dennett's concepts of the "Cartesian theater" — the illusion that there is a "central experiencer" and true facts about what is experienced when and how (featured prominently in *Consciousness Explained*) — and "Cartesian gravity" — the evolutionary force that pulls us into this illusion due to its efficacy in helping us navigate the world as organisms (in *From Bacteria to Bach and Back*). I think these terms are great tools for explaining [REDACTED]; you may even use them as a

springboard to come up with your own term (I'm not convinced "[REDACTED]" would be ideal).

- ▷ Regardless of whether you adopt the previous structural points, many things will likely need to be reordered, and some will have to be reduced or expanded upon. In particular, here are some changes that I think would be most effective:
  - ▶ Omit Tolstoy's "[REDACTED]" story at the end of Chapter 1; but move his [REDACTED] to somewhere near the beginning of the first chapter — I think this would make a great "hook."
  - ▶ Expand upon which definition(s) of [REDACTED] you plan on using, ideally somewhere in Chapter 2.
  - ▶ Try to consolidate most of the personal anecdotes (e.g., about your [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] from Chapter 2) into the first chapter.
  - ▶ Wait to unveil your criteria for [REDACTED] until you've more thoroughly established your reasons for choosing to [REDACTED] and what purpose you designed the criteria to serve.
  - ▶ Wait to introduce The Truth until you've thoroughly established the criteria for [REDACTED] and their purpose.
  - ▶ Abridge the section detailing [REDACTED].
  - ▶ Reconsider the relevance of Chapter 4 (the one mostly on evolution) to your overall narrative; either omit, move, or redistribute as appropriate. It may fit better with one of the chapters to follow Chapter 8, since you allude to addressing the dissolution of boundaries "between [REDACTED]" — an idea that seems connected to at least the middle and end of Chapter 4.
  - ▶ Abridge the sections on specific [REDACTED] phenomena (e.g., [REDACTED]), and consider consolidating all [REDACTED] discussion (Chapter 5) and combining it with the content of Chapter 6.
  - ▶ Clarify the points about [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], if relevant; omit if they do not contribute.
  - ▶ Omit or move all references in Chapter 6 to "real" [REDACTED]; if you want to include them, shift them to near the end of the book, in order to avoid clouding your thesis.
  - ▶ Move or redistribute most of Chapter 7 ([REDACTED]) to somewhere earlier in the book — this would help introduce more "[REDACTED]" ideas (e.g., most of Chapters 7 and 4) before the more "[REDACTED]" ideas (e.g., most of Chapter 5) along the lines of the argumentative structure I suggested above.

[paragraphs omitted from sample]

## Rhetoric

- ▷ As alluded to earlier, **credibility is essential** when addressing theories like [REDACTED], which will likely strike many skeptical readers as far-fetched and potentially pseudoscientific or even anti-scientific.
  - ▶ Especially with some of the concepts you bring into later chapters, you're definitely going to need to include **thorough citations**, and possibly footnotes or endnotes. Beyond reassuring your audience of the potential scientific validity of the ideas you discuss, particularly with regard to [REDACTED], you could shift the burden of

trying to interpret and explain a massive body of literature on some extremely complex topics, allowing the theorists to (sort of) speak for themselves.

- ▶ It's very important to **illustrate that you're not just making your own interpretations of the science**. In my experience, the primary value of expertise is not how much you've *read* on a certain topic, but the exposure to lab meetings, conferences, and peer critique, which almost invariably evaporate common misunderstandings of those ideas (see *Why Trust Science?* by Naomi Oreskes or *Science as Social Knowledge* by Helen Longino for similar perspectives on the nature of expertise). Citations are rhetorically crucial in part because they show that these ideas, which may sound absurd at first glance, have been considered and endorsed by people who have been embedded in the epistemic landscape of their fields long enough to be certain they have all the necessary background knowledge and are avoiding common confusions.
- ▶ The appeal to authority may technically be a logical fallacy, but it can be a very useful rhetorical device. I was extremely doubtful of your interpretations of [REDACTED] until I did a little independent reading and discovered how **many highly respected figures in both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] have advocated similar positions**. (The thing that really solidified the plausibility of [REDACTED] for me was hearing it endorsed by [REDACTED], knowing how massively influential he was in [REDACTED] — although I wouldn't include ideas like [REDACTED] until later in your book, for the reasons I mentioned previously.)
  - ▽ But you need both *quality* and *quantity* in your sources: the more well-respected theoreticians you cite discussing these ideas amongst themselves, and the more thoroughly you discuss **specific things that they have said**, the more credible you will appear. A skeptical reader can dismiss only one or two individual quotes as being taken out of context; more is better.
  - ▽ One elegant way to do this might be to tell a brief historical story that indirectly confirms that all the theorists being mentioned are well-respected [REDACTED], major figures in the field, and that they were not immediately dismissed from their fields — that in fact, their ideas were elaborated upon, spawning their own [REDACTED] research programs.

[paragraphs omitted from sample]

- ▶ While audacious or counterintuitive claims can be a good way to hook a reader, they must be used sparingly and with utmost care.
  - ▶ You tend to use a lot of rigorous-sounding words, like "undeniable"; "irrefutable"; "the only rational option." Overuse of this kind of phrasing can unintentionally highlight weak points in your argument by raising the audience's intellectual vigilance, so it may backfire and make you sound *less* credible. This is an instance where you can't just "talk the talk;" you have to "walk the walk." In other words, when it comes to the qualities of your argument: **show, don't tell**.
  - ▶ I also think it might backfire when you say that only irrational or insane people would disagree with you about something. This can make readers mentally dig in their heels, even if they *do* agree with your claim.
    - ▽ For example, you claim that no sane human would think that [REDACTED]



██████████, or that no rational person could believe in ██████████  
██████████. Yet historically, there have been countless people who appeared sane and rational in all other domains, but were convinced of either or both of those propositions, and even defended them at length on moral and logical grounds. While I think most modern readers will agree that ██████████, they will likely also treat your unique claim to sanity and rationality with great skepticism.

- ▽ If you try to claim that people who believed in the morality of ██████████ or the truth of ██████████ *must* be insane or irrational by virtue of those beliefs, then you may be committing a no-true-Scotsman fallacy. Your intended point seems to be that your beliefs are so unassailable that no sane person could disagree with them, but the point you logically end up making is that *anyone who doesn't agree with you* must be insane or irrational.

[remaining pages omitted from sample]

## EDITORIAL NOTE (SAMPLE)

Project Title: [REDACTED]  
Writer: [REDACTED]  
Editor: Anna Sedlacek  
Word Count: 3,379  
Date: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED],

I am always happy to see scientific work that steps back and expands the scope of the field. To help you drive home the importance of your contributions, I've condensed most of the overarching issues here; some more specific points are highlighted in the margins of the [REDACTED] draft.

### Table of Contents

Data Analysis	1
Structural Emphasis	2
Introduction	2
Discussion	3
Flow	4
Style	4
Discretionary Suggestions	5
Fine-Tuning the Coding Scheme	5
Limitations Subsection	5
Potential Ideas to Explore in Discussion	6
Conclusion	6

### Data Analysis

I discuss this first because it may have the greatest impact on future drafts of the manuscript. Your coding scheme may give some readers pause: from my perspective as a naïve reader, the lumping and splitting seemed somewhat unmotivated. I think it's important to justify your category choices to some degree. Ideally, this would not just be a bottom-up categorization scheme based on observed patterns, but a top-down process with reference to your overarching goals.

One concern I had about the coding scheme was the number of behaviors categorized as "other." Having read the coding sheet you showed me, I'm wondering why, for just one example, things like "[REDACTED]," "[REDACTED]," and "[REDACTED]" weren't grouped into a category like "[REDACTED]."

I think my worries as a reader would be assuaged if you justified your coding scheme more clearly in terms of the goals of your study. How do your categorization choices stem *specifically* from your goal of exploring [REDACTED]?

When explaining your decisions, a couple of levels of analysis are warranted. Reading your initial results, I wondered about your choices of when to discuss or analyze parent categories



Finally, be sure that the first sentences in your opening and closing paragraphs in the introduction reflect the key ideas you intend to convey. Similarly, the final sentences in those paragraphs should forcefully express your key point at each stage. For example, ending the first paragraph on the note that [REDACTED] paradigms are ideal for this type of investigation is relatively weak because it's not the central idea of the first paragraph; consider focusing the final sentence there on the *raison d'être* of your study itself.

## Discussion

One major thing lacking in the discussion are *specific* implications for how future research might make use of the insights from this study, as well as the theoretical significance of some individual findings. You say "many of these [REDACTED] have not been systematically studied," but I think the impact of your paper would be stronger if you laid out particular ways in which they *could* be fruitfully studied, (e.g., varied methods of employing [REDACTED]). I think the discussion would overall benefit from streamlining what's currently there, and then fleshing out more specific theoretical implications for the field. For every contribution from your study that you mention here, it might be useful to play devil's advocate and ask, "So what?"

For example, rather than focusing on the mere fact that the [REDACTED] was previously undocumented, you could explore its relative [REDACTED] novelty and propose future studies investigating the flexibility of a [REDACTED]. If [REDACTED] had a certain set of means of [REDACTED], does that imply that the [REDACTED] underpinning those behaviors was co-opted to contend with [REDACTED]? You could even use this example to propose investigation of specific [REDACTED] more generally, each underpinning a set of [REDACTED].

One other area that I think deserves a lot more attention in the discussion is the question of potential consequences of using different tactics against [REDACTED], and how that might impact their decision to employ tactics that might be more or less effective against [REDACTED]. You obliquely point this out a bit in your fourth-to-last paragraph, but I think it should be explored more with reference to things like the

[REDACTED]

A few of the middle-to-end paragraphs had specific problems that I've highlighted in the manuscript itself.

Finally, in the last paragraph, I would shift emphasis away from *a priori* predicted defenses and the magnitude of the study. I would instead emphasize how your data highlights the narrowness of the scope of past investigations. You should end on the conceptual avenues that might be brought to light by the huge diversity of defenses [REDACTED], and by the mere

fact that there were so many big differences between *even the few* scenarios you used to explore different [REDACTED].

## Flow

Many of the transitions between paragraphs and sentences in the introduction seem somewhat abrupt and unmotivated. It would read more smoothly if the final sentences in each paragraph implied more about where the next paragraph was going, and if the first sentences in each paragraph drew more from the last idea in the previous paragraph. Consider why you ordered the paragraphs the way you did, and try to be clearer about why you're about to talk about the next idea: guide your audience by the hand. Some paragraph and sentence transition examples:

- ▶ Lines 23-26: seems like you jump between the two sentences without an obvious connection; try to tie the two limitations together more clearly and explicitly (e.g., "limiting the scope of potential [REDACTED] contexts also limits the scope of potential defenses").
- ▶ Lines 26-27: sudden shift to dry definition; also unclear why you're giving the definition, since it doesn't come up anywhere else.

In the discussion, I felt there wasn't much motivation for the way the following ideas were sequenced:

- ▶ transitioning to the past [REDACTED] literature
- ▶ introducing the "[REDACTED]" defense
- ▶ transitioning from "[REDACTED]" to defense success rates and [REDACTED]
- ▶ bringing up [REDACTED] defenses & [REDACTED] (in the middle of a paragraph)

Apart from transitions, I think the order of the first few paragraphs of the discussion might benefit from a clearer narrative. Here's a sketch of a more coherent potential throughline:

- ▶ Open the discussion by reiterating the specific limitations in the existing literature (rather than just referring to "gaps" on line 227).
- ▶ Then say something like "This study broadened the scope, both in terms of the variety of defenses [REDACTED], and in terms of their strategic contextual use of those defenses."
- ▶ Then you could transition into the [REDACTED] literature by pointing out that the broadened scope has implications for existing hypotheses and frameworks, like [REDACTED]. This would drive home the importance of your work more clearly.
- ▶ After that, you might reorganize the two paragraphs on [REDACTED] a bit so they flow more naturally as an argument that this study should change the way we think about past ones (and trim the fat wherever the info isn't directly related to that).

## Style

I advise thinking more carefully about how word choice and sentence structure can impact emphasis. More sentences in key areas of the manuscript should be structured and worded with an eye toward emotional impact, especially the first and last few sentences in both the intro and discussion. For example:

- ▷ Line 23: "using an [REDACTED] paradigm explicitly identifying the relationship between [REDACTED]" — in our consultation, you mentioned that you were apprehensive about the systematicity of your [REDACTED], so try to avoid using words like "explicitly," which emphasize rigorous and systematic investigation, as opposed to exploration.
- ▷ Lines 45-46: saying "that [REDACTED] have developed a suite of mechanisms" doesn't adequately convey the diversity of behaviors that should come across from your study.
  - ▶ Maybe start this paragraph with a contrasting idea, like the fact that very *few specific* defenses have been postulated or explored — now would be a good time to bring back those specific references that I suggested you cut from the first paragraph.
  - ▶ Then, expand here and emphasize that it's not just [REDACTED], it's [REDACTED]!
- ▷ Lines 45-51: use energetic, high-impact language like "completely ignored" or "vastly overlooked" when discussing the excessive focus on [REDACTED] in the literature.
- ▷ Lines 76-77: rather than saying "not intended" (which gives the impression of the [REDACTED] choice being unmotivated), focus on the importance of your exploratory [REDACTED].
  - ▶ If possible, try justify your choice by reference to **specific design flaws** that might have been present if you tried to vary the [REDACTED] more systematically: would you have constrained the results? Would you have unintentionally limited the scope of your exploration?

## Discretionary Suggestions

The following ideas are less essential than those I've mentioned so far, but if you have the time to implement them, I think they would still make worthwhile improvements.

### *Fine-Tuning the Coding Scheme*

Depending on how easy you find it to explain your existing coding scheme, perhaps consider reorganizing some of the items. For example:

- ▷ Is "[REDACTED]" best conceptualized as a subcategory within the parent category of [REDACTED]? Why not view it as a token within a new [REDACTED] subcategory like "[REDACTED]," which might also include tokens like "[REDACTED]"?
- ▷ Why split [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] into separate categories in the analysis? [REDACTED]
- ▷ Why split [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]? Do you expect different [REDACTED] processes behind each?

None of the above questions should be interpreted as necessarily implying *better* categorizations: rather, I pose them to prompt clearer consideration and explication of the reasoning behind the coding scheme, whichever you end up choosing. However, I do think it would be easier for readers to process Figure 1 if you used broader category levels (e.g., "[REDACTED]" rather than "[REDACTED]" or "[REDACTED]"), and then made additional figures to explore the

distribution of any subcategories across different scenarios that stood out on a more fine-grained level.

### *Limitations Subsection*

While you don't want to undermine the usefulness of your own data, you may want to at least address the presence of some specific concerns in a Limitations subsection. In particular:

- ▷ I suspect a lot of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] will be concerned about the very [REDACTED] nature of your scenarios, so it's important to make clear the potential limitations of that, especially insofar as you are positing [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED].
- ▷ It could be useful to point out that the [REDACTED] may affect some of your [REDACTED] more than others, and maybe lightly explore some potential consequences of that (no more than a sentence or two is necessary).
- ▷ To preserve the value of your study in the literature, frame your [REDACTED] this way: "Now that we're aware of the breadth of [REDACTED], more systematic investigation of context-sensitive defense deployment is necessary before we can draw any conclusions about [REDACTED]."

### *Potential Ideas to Explore in Discussion*

What are the implications of [REDACTED] for systematic variation in the use of each defense type across scenarios? For example, the [REDACTED] scenario seems more isolated from [REDACTED] than [REDACTED], so [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. What would you have predicted to change about [REDACTED], and what are the implications of the actual differences you found?

Also, are there any important theoretical implications of the fact that [REDACTED] made up almost a third of the [REDACTED]? Given the importance of the [REDACTED] paradigm in your study, it's noteworthy that the [REDACTED] defenses were [REDACTED], likely with no knowledge of their significance in [REDACTED]. Beyond the obvious ([REDACTED] investigated it because it's common), are there deeper reasons you could explore about why this comes up so much?

### *Conclusion*

I think your manuscript will most benefit from shifting word choice and distribution of ideas to emphasize the exploratory value of your study. Unless you uncover deep concerns with your coding scheme as you write (which has happened to me before!), the good news is that you probably don't need much restructuring. Please let me know when you have had a chance to look over my suggestions so that we can schedule the outro consultation.

Looking forward to your response!

Sincerely,  
Anna Sedlacek