Review report

*Managing Disclosure Outcomes in Intelligence Interviews* is a stage-1 registered report focusing on empirically testing the proposed model of disclosure decisions in intelligence interviews. In the preliminary study, the authors examined how estimated cost and benefit of disclosing specific information could impact the disclosure decisions. Consistent with the proposed model, unguarded information with low cost and high benefit were most likely to be disclosed while guarded information (high cost and low benefit) were most unlikely to be disclosed. Rates of disclosure for low-stake (low cost and low benefit) and high-stake (high cost and high benefit) information fell in between. The materials, data, as well as analysis scripts are available for inspection and consistent with the descriptions in the manuscript. The proposed study is a conceptual replication of the preliminary study with several featured changed. The materials as well as analysis plan are shared and reported.

Overall, my opinion is that the manuscript is well-written and the potential findings are of scientific value. Therefore, I believe that this work has the potential of being recommended by PCI RR. However, I did notice that there are certain minor issues that could be further improved. Therefore, I suggest a minor revision for the current submission.

Below please see my more specific comments.

1. The authors mentioned individual differences in disclosure. The package *jtools* has a function *summ* can provide the intra-class correlations, which maybe more intuitive than variances.
2. In addition, visualization of the random effects would be even better for reader’s understanding (not a must).
3. Is there a measure to ensure participants will complete viewing the video?
4. The authors stated that bimodal distribution is most obvious in the high-stake condition, consistent with the model. I was wondering why wouldn’t we see the pattern in the top panel of Figure 2. From the top panel, it seems that participants disclosed various numbers of details ranging from 1-6 (or maybe I misread the Figure).
5. The authors mentioned generalizability as a goal of the proposed study. It does not seem obvious to me that the proposed study examines whether the effects could be generalized to different settings/contexts or different populations or methods. From my perspective, the proposed study aims to replicate the findings in the preliminary study with a highly similar method and materials while fixing certain factors that potentially could have impacted the results (e.g., the mismatch of details and cost/benefit weights).
6. Could the authors provide the scripts for the simulation-based power analysis on OSF?
7. The texts of each scenario involved in the proposed study are quite long. Has the authors planned measures to ensure attentiveness, other than the memory questions at the very beginning? This could have an impact on the experiment results, especially when the study is a online study. Although, I can also understand that the results from the preliminary study is reassuring to a certain extent.
8. Is there any other compensation scheme other than the lottery?