

Review for: Implicit Ideologies: Do Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation Predict Implicit Attitudes?

*Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript. Overall, I believe that this project has the potential to become a compelling registered report. However, the current version appears more like a draft of the general idea - in my view, much more detail and precision are needed, particularly with regard to hypotheses, analysis pipeline, and description of measures, to turn this into a full registered report. I have reviewed the manuscript following the PCI-RR stage 1 criteria below.*

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

*As I understand it, there are two (or more) research questions here: the first concerns the relation between self-reported RWA / SDO and implicit attitudes about related topics. This question is justified: the existing evidence base has produced mixed findings.*

*Another question concerns whether implicit and explicit attitudinal measures are capturing the same underlying construct, and the validity of the IAT (“are implicit attitudes consistent with explicit?”). At this point, it is unclear to me how exactly these two questions will be evaluated, that is, which parts of the design will be used to draw conclusions about these questions. I do not fully understand how the validity of the IAT could be tested with this design – wouldn’t differences between implicit and explicit attitudes be expected from an IAT perspective? I would appreciate if the authors could describe their reasoning and expectations with regard to these questions in greater detail, and link them more clearly to the analyses that will be conducted.*

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

*The authors propose the hypothesis that “RWA and SDO will predict implicit attitudes in line with explicit attitudes toward a range of relevant topics”. In my opinion, this hypothesis is not sufficiently precise and contains multiple aspects that should be more clearly differentiated.*

*First, I think that the relation between RWA /SDO and the respective explicit attitudes should be tested in a separate hypothesis. It may be that, contrary to expectations, these relations do not emerge in the predicted fashion (although it appears unlikely).*

*Second, I would like the hypotheses to clarify which precise topics are expected to be related with RWA and SDO, and which topics are expected to be differentially related to RWA / SDO. That is, are there topics for whom you expect only an association with RWA and not SDO (and vice versa)? In the introduction, it is hinted that such differential relations exist, but then this is not further addressed.*

*Which conclusions will be drawn if the predicted relations emerge for some topics and not for others? I would recommend to describe the different possible patterns of results, and which conclusions would follow.*

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

*There are several aspects with regard to this criterion that require clarification.*

*First: Which participants will be included in the analysis, and why? Will everyone from this data set be included? As the data are already collected, the authors could provide much more*

*specific information about the sample size and power considerations (beyond the rule of thumb mentioned in the Study Design table).*

*With regard to the analysis pipeline, the authors say that they will conduct SEM with FIML. Many questions remain open here: what will the precise SEM look like? I would like to see the specific paths that will be estimated, ideally in a graphical depiction. Which variables are estimated at the latent level? What does the measurement model look like?*

*More generally, will one large SEM including RWA, SDO, implicit and explicit measures be estimated? Will there be separate models? How will model fit be evaluated? How will bad fit be dealt with? Which parameters are relevant for testing the hypotheses? Ideally, the authors would describe the SEM they plan to conduct in detail and describe which parts of the model test which hypotheses.*

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

*Although a lot of documentation about this data set appears to be available on OSF, I would appreciate if the authors could provide more information about the methodology and the measures in their manuscript. Especially with regard to the implicit and explicit attitudes that will be analyzed, it should be clearly stated which topics will be analyzed, and how these were measured. Currently, the authors state examples of topics using “such as”, which implies that not all topics that will be analyzed are mentioned.*

*Also, could the authors describe the planned missingness design in a bit greater detail? I am not familiar with this approach. Why did participants in design A receive one, and those in design B two topics? Does this have any implications for the analyses (e.g., should the type of design be included as a random effect in the model)?*

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).

*As far as I understand, the authors did not yet include any outcome-neutral conditions. In the context of the SEM, I think this could pertain to considerations of model fit (as mentioned above), and how bad fit will be dealt with.*

*I hope some of these comments are helpful and wish the authors the best of luck with this interesting work.*