The registered report aims to replicate Study 2 from Monin and Miller (2001), which is an influential paper in the moral licensing literature. The proposed study also aims to extend the original study using additional two conditions which will examine domain-specificity of moral licensing.

I do not follow the literature on moral licensing closely, but in my opinion the manuscript describes the literature well and the overview of the existing studies provides sufficient justification for the need of the proposed replication.

Given that the planned study largely uses methods of the original study, I do not have many comments regarding the methods. Most of my comments are rather minor and should be fairly straightforward to address:

1. The paper mentions an existing replication of Study 1 from Monin and Miller (2001), but does not go into details of the original study and the replication. It might be good to briefly describe the original Study 1 and how it differs from Study 2 the registered report aims to replicate (pp. 12-13).
2. I do not think that resources of an average lab are relevant to the justification of the sample size. I also do not believe that limited potential impact can be directly concluded from a small effect size. A small effect can have large impact, for example, if the phenomenon occurs frequently or if the effect might be larger in the real-world (p. 15).
3. The method section is said to be written in past tense, but the beginning of the participants subsection is in future tense (p. 16).
4. The federal wage is written to be „7.25USD/hour, per minute“. The „per minute“ is probably a mistake. It should be also mentioned that it is „U.S.“ federal wage.
5. The difference in participant populations is not mentioned in deviations. The original study was conducted with undergraduate students more than 20 year ago, so it is possible that racist and sexist attitudes might differ between the original and replication samples.
6. It is not clear from H1 (and also H3 and H4) whether it relates to all credentials or only to the same-domain credentials. The hypotheses seem to include all credentials, but the analysis later uses only the same-domain credentials.
7. H4 is phrased in such a way that it seems to specifically predict that H3 holds and the relationship between reputational concern and prejudice is just smaller in size with moral credentials. However, the analysis just looks whether the interaction is positive, which is also consistent, for example, with no relationship of reputational concern and prejudice in the condition without credentials and a positive relationship between the two variables in the condition with credentials.
8. On p. 23 it is mentioned that there is no prediction with regards to the difference between different-domain credentials and no credentials. It is okay to not have a prediction, but it seems important to note that this tests whether cross-domain licensing also works. This cannot be determined by the test of H2 alone, because if the effect predicted by H2 holds, it is still possible both that cross-domain licensing has no effect and that it has an effect, and it is just smaller.
9. Why are H1 and H2 tested once separately and once together? I am not sure whether the two analyses are mathematically equivalent, but if they are, then they are redundant, and if they are not, then it should be mentioned which is the focal test of the hypothesis.
10. If preference for males/Whites is influenced by the manipulation of credentials, excluding all participants with some preference for sex/race in analysis of H3 and H4 may result in the problem of conditioning on a post-treatment variable (see Montgomery et al., 2018).
11. I am not entirely sure, but I believe that using non-centered variables and their interactions in the test of H3 makes the main effect non-interpretable (see Dalal & Zickar, 2012).
12. The hypotheses are directional, will the statistical tests be one-tailed?
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