

Dear Authors,

After reading your Stage 2 submission and the Appendix, I'd like to say that I'm very pleased with the paper. I have a few, usually minor comments, I'd like to share with you. I'll split this review into three parts: (1) adherence to the preregistered protocol, (2) results; (3) discussion.

Adherence to the preregistered protocol:

I'm glad that, considering the complexity of the design/analytic choices, the authors have managed to strictly follow the preregistered protocol. They transparently disclose three deviations from the Stage 1 submission. Each change in the design/analysis (especially the first one - standardizing the executive function index) is justifiable and has strengthened the paper. Naturally, the abstract has been rewritten to reflect the results.

Results:

The authors have found that lump-sum cash transfer usually has a minor positive effect on executive functions both short- and long-term ($b = 0.13$ and 0.08). However, as they correctly highlight several times across the text, the evidence is non-conclusive ($BF_{s10} = 1.51$ and 0.56 ; Cis usually crossing 0). The findings hold across analytical/data processing choices, however, operationalization of the cognitive performance causes variation in the results.

The results of the primary analysis are comprehensibly reported. The results of the multiverse analysis, too, follow the best reporting practices. However, I'd welcome a more elaborated description of the bottom panel of Figures 1 and 3 – it's a bit less intuitive than the upper panel and maybe one additional sentence would save readers a lot of time trying to understand this visualization properly.

Could the authors double-check the results (and the corresponding code) presented in Figures 2 and 4? I think they are a bit counterintuitive - the largest prior leads to the highest support for the null compared with the other priors (I'd expect it to be the other way around).

A minor note – Figures 1-4 should actually be Figures 3-6, as Figure 1 depicts the flowchart, and the results of the primary analysis are visualized in Figure 2.

Discussion:

The main findings are comprehensively summarized and logically interpreted. However, the discussion would definitely benefit from adding more references to make more specific comparisons with previous studies as well as to back up the authors' reasoning – the current version of the discussion involves only four sources (three of those papers were co-authored by some of the authors of the present study).

I'd also suggest adding a paragraph focused specifically on the limitations of the study. It's true that the authors present potential limitations implicitly across the whole discussion, but maybe a standalone paragraph would make things clearer, even though it might require some restructuring of the discussion to preserve the flow. On a similar note, the authors offer only one suggestion for future research on the topic. I'd say that the present study offers more

food for thought on which directions could future research in the field of poverty alleviation focus/avoid.

The authors argue that “...it is possible that cash positively impacts working memory more robustly than inhibitory control as working memory is assessed in the digit span index” and further elaborate on that point in the discussion. However, the results of the multiverse analysis show that the unconditional money transfer has had usually negligible or even a negative effect (especially short-term) on the backward digit span test. Could the authors consider incorporating this finding into the discussion?

Minor issues:

Please check for typos, spacing, font size, etc.

As always, I hope that the authors will find the comments useful. I’m looking forward to reading the revised version of the paper/discussion!

Best,

Matúš