**Summary**

This is a stage 1 replication and extension of Studies 1 and 2 from Newman et al (2011). The original paper’s goal was to understand the value of celebrity possessions and the mechanisms driving their value. The original study posits three mechanisms: (1) association (sentimental value), (2) market forces (others having a higher willingness to pay at a future date) and (3) contagion (the transferal of immaterial quality/essence through physical contact) finding support for the latter. The authors plan to fully replicate the results from Study 1 and 2 that provide evidence for the contagion effect, with minor deviations, and extend across two dimensions:

* Physical proximity without physical contact; and
* Temporal proximity

**General Comments**

The authors are undertaking a very interesting replication project. Overall, I am impressed by the level of planning and detail. All deviations from the original paper are carefully outlined and the manipulation checks, justification for sampling and power analysis are clear for the reader. My comments, intended to improve the manuscript, aim to strengthen the part of the study that provides extensions beyond the original Newman et al (2011) design. Each of these extensions' designs appear valid but grounding both hypotheses more firmly in literature and providing a clearer explanation and motivation of extension 1 would strengthen the manuscript.

**Major Comments**

* As currently written, the extensions proposed in the study are geared around the existence of the contagion effect as the driver of celebrity object’s value. This means that if one doesn’t find support for this effect these extensions have lower value. However, each extension can have meaning/importance independent of which of the three mechanisms drives the result. Thinking through this in the manuscript would show the greater value of the extensions proposed, strengthen the validity of the extensions to be mechanism independent, and, in turn, strengthen the manuscript
* Extension 1 as explained on pages 15 and 16 is unclear to me as a reader. The ideas become clearer in the Manipulations later in the paper section but are still too vague for me to clearly evaluate. I'd urge the authors to rephrase this section and be clearer on what the extension is, and further ground the hypothesis in more literature.
* The hypothesis behind Extension 1 in Table 3 is unclear as currently written. Please adopt a more precise statement
* The hypothesis behind extension 2 currently argues that for positive morality celebrities' contagion is positive when there’s less time since contagion occurs and the opposite for negative contagion. These arguments are plausible, under the assumption that a “contagion effect” decays over time. However, the literature cited to support this is indirectly related. Reconsider whether the directionality of this hypothesis is needed.
  + Remark: This hypothesis as written is also contingent on a contagion effect being the main finding in the replication. As suggested above, one might reconsider this and thus the directionality on the hypothesis too

**Minor Comments**

The comments below are designed to help the reader better understand the ideas being presented:

* What is a contagion belief? (page 8/9)
* The explanation of contagion effects at the beginning of "contagion theory" on p8 seem inconsistent at first glance with the examples discussed in the paragraph "the importance of the contagion effect..." these examples don't speak directly to contagion as you defined it. I’d encourage the authors to rework this paragraph or potentially remove it as it isn’t essential to the manuscript.
* Who are these living people who aren't celebrities that participants list? It might be useful to provide the reader with an overview of what’s reported when the data comes in.

These comments are further thoughts that came to mind when reading the manuscript. The authors need not act on them in this study, but may find them useful at a later date:

* This study focuses on valence around moral values. There are interesting dimensions beyond morality that could be explored.
* A study that attempts to better separate association and contagion (as the authors mention, these are somewhat intertwined) can offer a cleaner insight on the role of contagion vs association. What the authors currently do sticks to the approach of Newman et al (2011), which is fine for what they are trying to do in this paper but as I read through both, I pondered the value of an experiment design that better separates.
* When reading this study and Newman et al (2011), I wondered how much a participant self-reporting the celebrities matters as opposed to a pre-specified list that could be crowd sourced or taken from a different source. What might be interesting there, is (although likely non-randomized) how different levels of exposure to a celebrity or different views about their morality interplay with the kind of effects found in this type of study.

Based on the evaluation criteria provided:

* **The scientific validity of the research question(s).**
  + Sufficient. More work needed on extension 1 as detailed above
* **The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypotheses, as applicable.**
  + Both hypotheses need better grounding in literature. Extension 1 needs to be clearer for me to provide an accurate evaluation.
* **The soundness and feasibility of the methodology and analysis pipeline (including statistical power analysis or alternative sampling plans where applicable).**
  + Well executed
* **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.**
  + Well executed
* **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).**
  + Extensions are currently explained conditional on finding a contagion effect. Please generalize to be mechanism independent.