This paper by Han et al. (2022) proposes a straight-forward replication of two studies of Will et al (2021); with some sensible follow-ups if needed. I'm looking forward to seeing the results, and would encourage the authors to contact me directly (alan.kingstone@ubc.ca) if they feel that I can be of any help.

I only have a couple of points to add regarding the replication itself.

STUDY 1

1. For Study 1 (replication of Will et al. Experiment 2), as noted in the Will et al. (2021) supplementary material (see below as well), Will et al. included with each image and question a short definition of the mind perception conditions: Agency (ability to do) and Experience (ability to feel). It's not clear that the present Study 1 is including the short definitions with the images. It might be useful to include them as the longer definitions provided at the start of the study can be a little confusing to participants and hard for them to remember.

Short Definitions Included with the Questions of Agency and Experience

Agency condition

Which person seems to have more Agency (ability to do)?

Experience condition

Which person seems to have more Experience (ability to feel)?

STUDY 2: Dictator Game

In order to look at individual differences, Will et al. (2021, Experiment 5) had participants first do a two-alternative forced-choice (2AFC) task, identifying which of the two people in the photo seem more Real and have more Agency and Experience. And only then, afterwards, did participants complete a one-shot dictator game task. It is not clear that this methodology will be the followed in Study 2, for the following reasons.

A. In the current Study 2 design, the authors *do* mention pictorial abstraction (Realness, Agency, or Experience), but they state that it will be a between-subject factor, not a within subject factor as was the case in Will et al. Experiment 5.

B. The authors make no mention of how Realness, Agency, and Experience will be assessed (as noted, in Will et al, Experiment 5, it was with a 2AFC task).

C. The procedure and data analysis sections make no mention of any measurement of pictorial abstraction at all, and just discuss the Dictator Game.

If my current reading of Study 2 is correct, then I would encourage the authors to consider doing the within-subject 2AFC task before the Dictator game, as it is then a full replication of Will et al.'s Experiment 5. It also carries with it the additional benefit of allowing one to measure individual differences. Finally, we have recently collected data that suggests the Dictator Game effect may be larger when participants first assess the images for realness, agency, and experience.

<u>Minor comment</u>

Page 6 "In conclusion, the original study .... The dictator game principle was upheld throughout the process, namely, <u>that the recipient did not influence the size of the allocation, and since the participants' actions were fully autonomous, they could reflect their own wishes in the experiment.</u>"

- I didn't quite understand what was meant by the underlined section. For example, in Will et al. (2021) the recipient (L1 vs L2) *did* influence the size of the allocation.