May 19th, 2024

Dear authors,

Thank you for your submission of this Stage 2 Registered Report, in which you have conducted a close replication study (with extension) of Lerner and Keltner (2001). I reviewed your Stage 1 manuscript and am pleased to have reviewed your Stage 2 manuscript as well and see the outcomes of your efforts.

Overall, I think it is a very good study, well-executed with a very transparent approach to the materials and reporting of the results. I have some smaller comments that I believe could improve the readability of the paper, and some may clarify aspects of the manuscript, which you can find below.

With best wishes,

Kelly Wolfe

**Larger comments**

* There are so many results that are discussed in the manuscript, which can be a bit confusing at times. I’d suggest including the hypothesis numbers with the outcomes to make it clearer to the reader which hypothesis the results refer to (e.g., H1).

**Smaller comments**

* (p. 14) The section on pre-registration and open science has missing information (currently in highlighted in red already).
* (p. 28) Missing word (or two) in the second line of the second paragraph (“Consistent with… *p* < .001).
* (p.32) The results mention risk-taking and risk preference interchangeably a couple times (both on page 32). Risk preference and risk-taking are similar but separate concepts; risk preference can be defined as the propensity to engage in behaviours or activities that are rewarding yet involve some potential for loss, such as activities associated with physical and mental harm to individuals (Mata et al., 2018). Risk is assumed to underlie, or explain, risk-taking behaviour, as risk-taking is an expression of someone’s preference or attitude towards the risk itself. As such, I would remove the mention of risk-taking in this section and replace this with risk preference.
* (p. 41) On page 41, you mention the following: “The subscales of the risk optimism reached higher reliability scores than in the analysis above…”. To me, it is unclear what is meant with *above*. I assume it means the approach to calculating (un)ambiguity in the main analysis. If so, I would refer to it in such words instead, so it is clearer to the reader.
* (p. 46) You mention that the effect of framing in the Pandemic Problem scenario may have been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, as this was a recent real-world scenario that involved large numbers of people dying. Is there any published work on whether people’s perception of numbers indicating losses, or framing of losses, has been affected?