

## **Response letter (Stage 1, Round 2)**

Dear Dr. Fillon (Recommender), Dr. Celniker (Reviewer 1), and Dr. Kouassi (Reviewer 2),

Thank you very much for your continued effort and time spent on our project. We were very happy to receive your positive and constructive feedback to sharpen our project further. As suggested by Dr. Fillon, we implemented the changes to the formatting, corrected our spelling at the respective spots in the manuscript, and ran further checks on the APA7 conformity. Further, we engaged with the considerations by Dr. Celniker and hope to have implemented them accordingly.

Best regards

Leopold Roth (corresponding author)

**Dr. Fillon (Recommender)**

Dear Dr. Fillon,

Thank you very much for your continued support of our project. We hope to have implemented all the critical points you and Dr. Celniker raised.

We look forward to further developing the project with you and the reviewers.

Regarding your remarks on the manuscript form, we hope to have addressed them correctly.

We further went through the entirety of the text several times and hopefully caught all pending flaws.

**Dr. Celniker (Reviewer 1)**

Dear Dr. Celniker,

Thank you for your continued engagement with our manuscript and respective project. We are very glad to benefit from your expertise and hope to have responded to your remarks adequately.

**Comment Dr. Celniker:**

*While I appreciate that the authors dropped the theoretical models that I believed had insufficient theoretical justification, I was now left a little unclear about how different results that could arise from the experiment may shed light on psychological theory. It could be helpful for the authors to run through some of the possible results of their research to give readers more of a sense of what's at stake.*

*E.g., if we do not find any differences between the male and female versions across both the work and care context, it would suggest that gender has little impact on effort moralization; if we find that there are differences between men and women in the care context but not in the work context, it would suggest X; if we find that there are difference between men and women in the work context but not in the care context, it would suggest Y; if we find that there are differences between men and women in both the work and care contexts, it would suggest Z.*

**Response:**

Thank you very much for your productive input on this matter. We fully agree that the manuscript benefited from some foreshadowing of results. We integrated a respective section before the introduction's 'current study' section. We hope to have attended to your suggestion appropriately. Yet, we decided to keep this section parsimonious, as we hope to discuss the implications for future theorizing in the light of the to-be-acquired data. Especially the potential downstream consequences of different patterns in moral judgment on secondary variables, such as payment or cooperation partner satisfaction. We hope you agree with our way of integrating your review and are looking forward to receiving your perspective on the results and our interpretation of them in the second stage of the manuscript.

**Dr. Kouassi (Reviewer 2)**

Dear Dr. Kouassi,

We are very pleased to see that we addressed your comments adequately. We hope to win you as a continuing reviewer in the next stage of our Registered Report again. Thank you very much for your positive evaluation of our manuscript.