**Thank you for the opportunity to review this Stage 2 manuscript, I enjoyed reading the results and conclusions. Overall, I believe that the authors have done a great job in following through with their proposal and have only a few (minor) comments. I first address the PCI-RR Stage 2 criteria before raising some additional points/questions.**

**2A. Whether the data are able to test the authors’ proposed hypotheses (or answer the proposed research question) by passing the approved outcome-neutral criteria, such as absence of floor and ceiling effects or success of positive controls or other quality checks.**

Yes, the data are fully able to test the authors’ proposed hypotheses. Although the authors did not specify outcome-neutral criteria necessary for testing their hypotheses, the model fit according to the dynamic fit indices seems adequate. However, the absolute fit indices did not indicate adequate fit for the measurement models. Perhaps the authors could elaborate on whether this is cause for concern or not. I am not very much familiar with dynamic fit indices, and some more details on this topic could be helpful for the reader.

**2B. Whether the introduction, rationale and stated hypotheses (where applicable) are the same as the approved Stage 1 submission.**

The introduction, rationale and stated hypotheses are fully consistent with the Stage 1 submission.

**2C. Whether the authors adhered precisely to the registered study procedures.**

Yes, the authors adhered closely to the registered study procedures. The only deviation I could find was that the authors focused their discussion on results with p-values that remained below the .05 cut-off, instead of the results that were deemed significant by the B-H procedure. This seems like a reasonable decision to me. However, perhaps the authors could briefly discuss if the overall conclusion would have been any different had one sticked precisely to the planned B-H procedure.

**2D. Where applicable, whether any unregistered exploratory analyses are justified, methodologically sound, and informative.**

The authors conducted one exploratory analysis that is mentioned in the discussion. In this analysis, the authors examined whether relations between RWA/SDO and the respective implicit/explicit attitudes resemble relations between general political conservatism and these implicit/explicit attitudes. Although this analysis appears reasonable, it does leave me a bit unsure as to what this means for the interpretation of the main results. To what extent are the observed links specific to RWA and SDO, or result from shared covariance with conservatism more generally?

**2E. Whether the authors’ conclusions are justified given the evidence.**

**The authors’ main conclusions appear well-justified given the evidence. Overall, I agree that the results indicate a good deal of consistency between implicit and explicit attitudes (at least with regards to their relationships with RWA and SDO).**

**There are two questions that remain open to me after reading the manuscript, and that perhaps the authors could address:**

**(1) Do you have any idea as to why some associations did not turn out as expected? I found it surprising that the anarchy/hierarchy pair, for instance, was not associated with SDO, neither implicitly nor explicitly. You already mention in the discussion that the relationships appear to be sensitive to the specific wording of a construct. What could these differences in wording be, and how could they explain the observed findings?**

**(2) What are the broader (theoretical) implications of these findings for the literature on implicit attitudes, the validity of the IAT, and/or the measurement of RWA/SDO?**

**Additional points:**

* **Perhaps I missed something, but I would be interested in the covariances between the implicit and explicit measures. In the introduction, you mention that one would not expect implicit and explicit attitudes to correlate perfectly, and that they are usually correlate around r = 0.30. Do you observe converging findings? Do these covariances support the conclusion that both measure the same underlying construct?**
* **Just as a side note: I noticed that the data are not yet publicly available, which appears to be a general policy from Project Implicit. This means that I could not check the reproducibility of the results.**