

Dear Dr. Nuijten,

Thank you for the feedback on our snapshot, much appreciated. We addressed your suggestions and provided a point-by-point reply to your comments:

- Why is it important to replicate this study?  
We added a sentence in the “Research question(s) and/or theory” section to make our motivation for conducting the current replication more explicit in the snapshot:  
  
“We chose to replicate Rozin et al. (1997) because it is a seminal study that sparked a long line of theoretical and empirical research on moralization in the domain of vegetarianism and beyond.”
- What is the intended sample size and who are the participants?  
Thank you, we added the following to “Study design and methods”:  
“We conducted a safeguard power analysis (lower bound of 60% confidence intervals) and aim to target to recruit 830 American participants from Prolific.”
- Which parts are the replication and which parts the extension(s)?  
We initially did not intend to elaborate on the extensions at this stage, yet to address your request we added the following to the “Hypotheses” section:  
  
“Our extension hypotheses: 1) moral-origin vegetarians reject the consumption of a wider range of animal meats and animal products/by-products than health-origin vegetarians, 2) moral-origin vegetarians are more strongly opposed to the use of animals for scientific testing, like a wider range of animals, and reject a wider range of products that directly or indirect involve the use of animals than health-origin vegetarians.”
- “We added new measures to facilitate our testing of the two extension hypotheses.” Measures of what?  
  
We added the following:  
“We followed the target article’s design and reconstructed the questions used in the original study using information provided in the target article - animal meat/product consumption and liking of animals. We added extension measures - opposition to the use of animals for scientific testing and rejection of products that directly/indirectly involve the use of animals.”
- Why is prediction 3 not important to assess a successful replication? Should it be included in the first place then?  
  
We planned to elaborate on all that in detail in our submission. Briefly, prediction 3 (that moral-origin vegetarians reject the consumption of a wider range of animal products than health-origin vegetarians) was not supported by the data in the original study.  
Our extension hypothesis – that moral-origin vegetarians reject the consumption of a wider range of animal meats and animal products/by-products than health-origin vegetarians – is a test and an extension of Prediction 3.  
We will expand on that in the full Stage 1 report.  
To avoid confusing readers of the snapshot, we removed the mention of the numbered predictions of the target article in the “Conclusions that will be drawn given different results” section:

“The replication of the article as a whole will be considered a successful replication if at least 4 or 5 out of the 5 predictions were supported, a mixed replication if 2 or 3 out of the 5 predictions were supported, and a failed replication if none or 1 out of the five predictions were supported.”

- If there is still space in the snapshot, I would also like to see a short explanation of a few additional points that I listed below. If there is no space in the snapshot, these are things to consider for the full Stage 1 report.

As there are space constraints in the snapshot in its present state, we are unable to address these additional points in the snapshot. However, we briefly address them below and will do so at length in the full Stage 1 report.

- Why copy the analysis plan from the 1997 paper? Does that present the best way to analyze these data?

We hope that this will all become clearer in the full submission, a 1 page snapshot does not allow for going into such details. Briefly, this is a direct replication, in a direct replication we first aim to run the analyses in the same way and under the same terms as in the original. We will make needed adjustments, analyses, and extensions, to go beyond the target article. We will note all deviations and include a detailed justification for each.

- Do you have any corrections for multiple testing planned?

We do not plan to correct for multiple testing. For the replications analyses, this is straightforward because only one statistical test will be used to evaluate the severity of each prediction, as was done in the target article.

For the extension hypotheses, we did not adjust alpha for multiple comparisons (i.e. we used the conventional alpha of .05), although multiple statistical tests will be conducted. This is because the individual statistical tests are all “individual tests of individual null hypotheses” and not tests of an intersection null hypothesis (Rubin, 2024, p.3).

Rubin, M. (2024). *Redundant multiple testing corrections: The fallacy of using family-based error rates to make inferences about individual hypotheses* (arXiv:2401.11507). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.11507>

- Which positive controls are planned?

We are not entirely sure what you meant. This is a correlational design and our main aim is to follow what the target article did. We currently do plan any further positive controls, yet would happy to revise accordingly if reviewers have feedback and/or reservations regarding our Stage 1 plan.