**Evaluation criteria for ERSP proposals and articles**

**(1) Proposals** (max. 6 pages A4, Times New Roman 12, double-spaced) should make clear which contribution is envisioned and how the contribution would fulfill the following criteria (not all may apply):

**- Content of the article:** The core of the theoretical review should be clearly linked to social-psychological phenomena, existing social-psychological literature(s), and one or more theoretical perspectives to be analyzed, compared, evaluated or synthesized

o Theoretical links with work from other disciplines are valuable as long as the intent is to apply insights from such literature to social-psychological theorizing and topics in a cumulative, integrative or reflective fashion

o Core references (5-10) should be provided to allow an evaluation of which literature(s) would be consulted, and on which body of work the review will be conducted

**- Aims and claims:** Moving beyond description or descriptive review of existing work, for instance through:

o Theoretical specification and deepening (of one theory/model), outlining the next step(s) and ways to test yet untested or new hypotheses

o Theoretical integration (of different theories/models), outlining how different theories can be combined or synthesized, or how isolated theories can be cross-fertilized

o Theoretical reflection by making explicit core assumptions behind the claims of the theory

o Making explicit any novelty/added value of the theory not covered by the above criteria

**- Concrete outcomes of the review**, for instance through:

o Development of specific hypotheses that future research can test

o Development of a research agenda, consisting of a coherent set of concrete research questions

o Applications of the new theory or theoretical integration, such as a new intervention or other concrete practical implications

o Implications of critical/reflective assessment of existing work, leading to the formulation of concrete guidelines or recommendations for relevant fields

**(2) The evaluation of the ERSP article** (max. 50 pages including references, but not counting tables or figures) will occur against the following criteria:

1 - Clear and explicit delineation of topic/content of the paper (e.g., which literature, which theory, which topic)

2 - Clear and explicit aims and claims of the paper

3 - Clear and explicit evaluation of added value/contribution of the paper

4 - Clear and explicit definitions of the key concepts used

5 - Clear and explicit assumptions underlying one's and/or other theoretical perspectives

6 - Clear and explicit link to, and where relevant legitimate differentiation from, previous theorizing and research on-topic

7 - Clear and explicit (research and real-life) examples and illustrations of the perspective(s) discussed, as to avoid uninformative abstractions

8 - Clear and explicit discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the relevant perspective(s)

9 - Clear and explicit identification of implications of the theoretical advancement (e.g., reinterpretation of previous findings; practical or societal implications)

10 - Clear and concrete outcomes of the theoretical article (e.g., generating new testable hypotheses, applied value, recommendations for the field based on critical reflection)

**Positionality and Constraints-on-Generality Statements**

We strongly encourage authors to integrate a *Positionality* statement in an *ERSP* article. This statement should describe and reflect on your (team's) perspective and how it influenced the scientific process and outcomes that you review in the ERSP article. This may pertain to research samples as well as theoretical assumptions, and to the narrow or broad literature base you review and cite. We encourage such a statement to be integrated in the article, as reflexivity is an essential part of the theorizing and research process:

Jamieson, M. K., Pownall, M., & Govaart, G. H. (2022). Reflexivity in quantitative research: a rationale and beginner's guide. https://psyarxiv.com/xvrhm

In line with the Positionality statement, we strongly encourage you to integrate a *Constraints on Generality* statement in your *ERSP* article. This statement helps to prevent inaccurate overgeneralizations and in doing so increases the quality of your review. It is important to also include important constraints on generality in the title and abstract of your paper. A recommendation for writing a COG Statement can be found in:

Simons, D. J., Shoda, Y., & Lindsay, D. S. (2017). Constraints on generality (COG): A proposed addition to all empirical papers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(6), 1123-1128.