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**Justice in the Eye of the Beholder: How Comparison Framing Affects the Perception of Global Inequality Through Social Emotions and Justice Sensitivity**

I enjoyed reading the revised Stage 1 RR and appreciate the authors for taking the time to respond to reviewers. I had a few smaller comments below, most of which deal theoretically with SDO and justice sensitivity.

* I am still not convinced that SDO should be a covariate and not a moderator. The authors write on page 22 that they are interested in “considering individual-level variables that might influence the differential processing of inequality-related information as possible moderators”. That is SDO or system justification/belief in a just world. The justice sensitivity piece doesn’t fit. That being said, if the authors are trying to expand the moderators that have been studied in regard to comparison framing, they should definitely do that! That’s not the vibe I’m getting from the manuscript though.
* The critiques of SDO listed are likely also critiques of Justice Sensitivity (if its been studied yet in such a systematic way as SDO), making the purported contextual nature of SDO as the reason why it needed to stay as a covariate feel less theoretically sound. Indeed, from my read of the articles listed, SDO’s effect becomes weaker or stronger but doesn’t flip in a different direction. Or SDO’s effect is particularly relevant in situations that are in line with the ideology itself (more competitive situations or towards more competitive groups). That doesn’t make SDO contextually dependent in the way the authors seem to be putting forth. Instead, it shows the internally consistent way SDO has been theorized, not giving a strong reason why it shouldn’t be used as a moderator.
* Does SDO interact with the framing manipulation in Studies 1 and 2? The fact that the effect doesn’t work without SDO means that there should be a bit more theorizing as to what exactly does controlling for SDO do/mean. As it stands right now, it feels like controlling for SDO is removing any motivated reasoning based on hierarchy and dominance from the equation, which has implications for which hypothesis (4 or 5) will be more likely to represent the data. That might not be true, but I encourage the authors to think through what this means.
* Justice sensitivity is mentioned several times in the introduction, but it’s not defined in any real way until Study 3.
* While I get the stimuli used the phrase “developing country” instead of “low income”, I believe it’s helpful to use the phrase “low income” exclusively in the text. The footnote explains what happened. It is also important because the reason why low-income countries are low income is because of high income countries. Colonialism is the root of the current global inequality, and I believe that’s worth mentioning here.
* I was a bit confused about the ordering of the items in each study. Why is one dependent variable measured separately from the other, and social emotions measured in between the two dependent variables but they are mediators?
* I found Table 1 on page 12 very confusing. Maybe the formatting is off?
* I believe it’s APA standard to write the exact *p* value unless it is below *p* < .001.
* The moderated mediation results would be a bit easier to follow in a model format. Something to think about for the final paper.
* Post-hoc power analyses aren’t as helpful given they are a monotonic transformation of the p value. What tends to be more helpful are sensitivity analyses, that shows what is the smallest effect size you could have found with your sample at a given power level (usually 80%).
* The effects in Germany were smaller than the Norwegian sample. Based on the hypotheses, we should have expected larger effects given that Germany has more inequality in it, correct? This is me trying to understand the article’s logic.
* It took me looking up the justice sensitivity scale to understand why the victim sensitivity subscale wouldn’t make sense to use in this context. I thought this scale was measuring the sensitivity of people understanding the perspective of the victim, but that’s not it, ha!
* The authors discuss the subscale of the justice sensitivity scale was mutually exclusive dynamics, but it is likely that folks will score high (or low) on all three. This is especially true for the beneficiary and perpetrator items. That got me thinking that it might be worthwhile making the scale about global inequality to actually tap into “differential processing of inequality-related information” dimension the authors are interested in. As they write, global inequality can be an abstract concept, making it a bit hazier to understand why people’s beliefs about how they deal with inequality in the abstract would be related to their beliefs about global inequality.
* Why is Hypothesis 1 still a hypothesis when it hasn’t been supported in Studies 1 and 2?
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