Review of Stage 1 Registered Report by Yim Tung (Emanuel) Cheng, Gilad Feldman entitled **Do pain and effort increase prosocial contributions?: Revisiting the Martyrdom Effect with a Replication and extensions Registered Report of Olivola and Shafir (2013)**

1. **Scientific validity of research question**

This is an important and relevant proposal. I think the authors provide good reasons for conducting this replication. The research question is clear and valid. As it concerns a replication, it is already clear that this RQ is testable. Additionally, having more certainty about the Martyrdom Effect and whether it indeed exists in different contexts is valuable because it has important practical implications, as the authors also indicate by saying that the findings by Olivola and Shafir (2013) “have been impactful and offered a new perspective on altruistic behavior and charitable giving.” However, to me the theoretical background and rationale for choosing this specific study is not clear enough yet. The background part of the report should, in my opinion, be written for an audience that is not directly familiar with the studies by Olivola and Shafir (2013). So someone should be able to understand the current theoretical background without having (just) read the paper by Olivola and Shafir (2013). To give an example, the first sentence of the background mentions a “donation matching scheme”. What is this exactly? This should be clarified.

The Martyrdom effect itself is clearly explained. However, the third paragraph under “**Martyrdom Effect**” is unclear to me. What was exactly tested in experiment 3 by Olivola and Shafir (2013) and why?

Also the choice to replicate these particular studies (Study 3, 4, and 5) explained under “**Choice of study for replication: Olivola and Shafir (2013)”** is not yet sufficiently clear to me. Why these studies specifically? This could be justified better, especially the explanation on page 10 is unclear to me, this part seems more like a method section to me, so would it be possible to explain this in more theoretical terminology?

By the way, I think this study could also be relevant to mention in the theoretical background as it clearly relates to the current topic: Xygalatas, D., Mitkidis, P., Fischer, R., Reddish, P., Skewes, J., Geertz, A. W., ... & Bulbulia, J. (2013). Extreme rituals promote prosociality. *Psychological science*, *24*(8), 1602-1605.

Smaller point: not all references are included in the literature list.

1. **Logic rationale and plausibility of hypotheses:**

Clear hypotheses for Study 4 and 5, but less clear for Study 3, I think this can be formulated more precisely.

1. **Soundness and feasibility of methodology and analysis pipeline:**

This is all clear. Because the current study concerns a replication, this is to a large extent similar as in the original article. Procedure, manipulations and data analysis are all explained well. However, I am not sure whether collapsing the three studies in one single design doesn’t create unwanted bias (e.g., one study affecting the next) even though they are randomized. It **does** diverge from the original study so I was happy to see that this is discussed and taken into account under “Order effects”. Sample seems large enough to detect small effects so the power of these replications should be good.

1. **Sufficient clarity and methodological detail for replication**:

Yes, this is all clear.