**1A. The scientific validity of the research question(s).**

**The research question is valid.**

**One comment I have is that the authors state that null-findings could potentially show that scarcity theory is (partially) wrong. Here, I think it is important to consider that the operationalization of financial scarcity in this experiment might also lead to null findings. Priming financial scarcity has been found to be somewhat unreliable (O’Donnell et. al., 2021; but see Shah et al., 2023 and O’Donnell et all., 2023). Being primed with scarcity related cues in the context of an experiment might be fundamentally different from experiencing financial scarcity in real life. Nevertheless and in line with the authors argument, the chosen priming manipulation is one that is predominantly employed in experimental research on financial scarcity. Thuis, finding out more about whether this manipulation has an effect on cognition for the poor (or not) in a highly powered RR has value for the field. I just want to caution that null-findings might be caused by a potential methodological issue (that is common in the literature) instead of an incorrect theory.**

* O’Donnell, M., Dev, A. S., Antonoplis, S., Baum, S. M., Benedetti, A. H., Brown, N. D., ... & Nelson, L. D. (2021). Empirical audit and review and an assessment of evidentiary value in research on the psychological consequences of scarcity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*(44), e2103313118.
* Shah, A. K., Zhao, J., Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2023). A scarcity literature mischaracterized with an empirical audit. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(26), e2206054120.
* O’Donnell, M., Nelson, L. D., & Moore, D. A. (2023). Reply to Shah et al. & Lynch et al.: In defense of replication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(26), e2304251120.

**1B. The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypotheses, as applicable.**

**The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypothesis is good.**

**1C. The soundness and feasibility of the methodology and analysis pipeline (including statistical power analysis or alternative sampling plans where applicable).**

**Strengths**

* **The authors aim to conduct a highly powered study that would be sufficient to detect smallest effect sizes of interest.**
* **The authors clearly describe which outcomes would result in acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses would be accepted.**
* **The analysis plan of the authors also allows them to properly distinguish between absence of evidence for an effect and evidence of absence for an effect.**

**Potential improvements**

* **To control for order effects, the authors suggest to have half of the participants first do the survey questions and then the experimental manipulation, and the other half the other way around. I would think that the questions about demographics and objective household finances could all be asked at the end of the study, as responses to those are unlikely to be affected by the prior procedure, but they might affect responses themselves when presented earlier. Instead of potentially biasing half of the responses and then correcting for it, I would suggest to biase none.**
* **The same might be argued for subjective measures of financial scarcity, but I think the choice is less clear. The authors use a control condition to avoid that any financial cues induce a “scarcity mindset” (which I support). However, filling in these scales might also induce scarcity related thoughts and thereby reduce cognitive function. I am wondering whether it might be better to move all these measures to the post experimental stage. There are always pros and cons for each chosen order, but I think having the main DV unaffected might be worthwhile to prioritize. I could be convinced otherwise.**
* **I would rephrase the “**Instructional Manipulation Check**” to “Attention Check”. From prior experience, make sure that participants can “unclick” their response. Otherwise, this might lead to many participants habitually clicking something, only to realise that they cannot undo this when they fully comprehended the question.**
* **I think it might be good to also control for recruitment method, as participants either receive monetary compensation for participating or not, and the authors affect this to be correlated with certain relevant demographic and financial variables.**

**1D. Whether the clarity and degree of methodological detail is sufficient to closely replicate the proposed study procedures and analysis pipeline and to prevent undisclosed flexibility in the procedures and analyses.**

* **Yes**

**1E. Whether the authors have considered sufficient outcome-neutral conditions (e.g. absence of floor or ceiling effects; positive controls; other quality checks) for ensuring that the obtained results are able to test the stated hypotheses or answer the stated research question(s).**

* **While I appreciate the validation of the experimental and control stimuli, I am missing a manipulation check. Showing these cues does not automatically guarantee that scarcity related thoughts were properly invoked, which would be needed to find a hypothesized effect of financial scarcity on cognitive performance. I would like to see a manipulation check that in the case of null findings, might help our understanding whether it could be explained by a weak manipulation or incorrect theory.**

**2. Other comments**

**A minor thing: I find the label of “abundance” for the relative scarcity condition a bit confusing. I understand that this relates to the abundance of others and not the own abundance. Maybe this could be clarified in the labelling.**