Dear Authors,

Thank you very much for the revised version of this Stage 1 RR. I checked the current version of the submission, author’s responses, and eyeballed the analytic code (the output in the response really helped me to understand the analysis). I’m satisfied with the changes the authors have made.

Just a minor suggestion. Regarding the analysis of qualitative feedback, the authors state: *“The feedback collected will be summarized in a supplementary Table and uploaded to the Open Science Framework. If relevant points are formulated, they will potentially be considered during Stage 2, but at this point on time we cannot say more about how we will use these qualitative feedbacks”*. I completely understand that, before the data collection, it is very tricky to discuss the potential feedback any further. However, I think that for the sake of transparency, a very short depiction of authors’ priors on what areas/topics they are likely to consider as “relevant points” should be present (either as a footnote or here in the review history).

Good luck with the program! Looking forward to reading the results & discussion.

All the best,

Matúš Adamkovič