The authors submitted a revision of their manuscript “Do Scarcity-Related Cues Affect the Sustained Attentional Performance of the Poor and the Rich Differently?” and their responses to the previous referee reports. I have several (minor) additional suggestions on how the authors could further improve their manuscript. Given that these concern mainly editorial issues, I would be content if their implementation is overseen by the recommender.

1. I would suggest to leave out the parentheses in the revised part of the abstract: *“[…] reveal the extent absolute scarcity (poverty) and relative scarcity (abundance) related cues 13 affect the sustained attentional performance of the poor in online contexts,[…]”.* This is because for a reader of the abstract, it is not clear yet that absolute scarcity refers to poverty cues that a participant might associate with themselves, while relative scarcity cues refers to abundance cues that a participant might associate with someone else.
2. Even when reading this manuscript a second time in depth, it took me a while to get my head around the different concepts of objective and subjective poverty, subjective absolute scarcity, subjective relative scarcity, etc… This might be on me, but I think a naïve reader might face similar struggles. My suggestion therefore is to maybe add a short paragraph in the introduction where the different dimensions (scarcity vs. poverty; objective vs. subjective; relative vs. absolute) are introduced and defined clearly, to simplify the language where possible, and make sure terms are used consistently throughout the paper.
3. The authors responded to my previous comment and adapted the writing in Table 1 in the column “*theory that could be shown wrong …*”, I still have concerns regarding this revised statement. The revised version states “*Scarcity theory, partially.* *Specifically, the prediction that textual cues related to scarcity impede cognitive performance in general*.”. However, the authors don’t test an effect of scarcity on cognitive performance in general, but contingent on financial status (poverty). This should be reflected in the statement. Moreover, the authors should revise the wording such that it matches the revised wording on “sustained attentional performance” instead of “cognitive performance”. I also found an instance of mentioning cognitive performance as a main DV in a footnote. If I am not mistaken, the table also still lists AIC as a criterion for model selection in the table. Please ensure that revisions are consistently implemented.