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This is my first streamlined review as an editor at Collabra. I started by reading the submitted cover letter, the paper, study 4 of Molho et al. (2017), the pre-registration for the study, and then I wrote down my overall view of the paper. Next, I read the previous decision letter from JESP.

Overall, this paper has three general aims: 1. To replicate the fourth study of Molho et al. (2017) paper on moral disgust and anger in a different population (US MTurk sample vs. Netherland Student sample) and language (US English vs. Dutch), with a slightly different but more thorough design (between-subject vs. within-subject) 2. Test the new hypothesis that physical strength and attractiveness are related to anger but not to disgust in moral violation, and 3. To replicate Sell et al. (2009) that physical strength in men (a 2019 replication attempt was not successful to find this relation), and physical attractiveness in women, are related to anger proneness. The authors achieve the above aims in a pre-registered study: They report support of the Molho et al.’s fourth study in a different population using a within-subject design: more disgust towards others-targeted violations than towards self, and disgust, in comparison to harm, is more related to indirect forms of aggression. However, they do not find support for their second nor third aims.

The authors, generally, do a great job describing how their pre-registration differs from the analyses performed. The first ANOVA reported is slightly different from the pre-registered analysis. If the analysis was really performed differently, please report why. If not, please change the language used to match that of the pre-registration.

In my opinion, this paper achieves what it promises, and it does it with open practices. Here are my thoughts on the previous editor’s comments:

1. Of course, a conceptual replication which uses real situations is generally more insightful, but this was not the aim of the study nor the pre-registration. I don’t agree with the editor that there are certain type of replications that we need and some that we don’t. Further, I can argue that if nothing, this study directly replicates a previous study using participants from a different culture. That by itself, going from a US population to a non-US population, merits credit.
2. I can see how the paper can be seen as unfocused. However, to me, given that harm and purity are very much involved in assessments, and feelings of, strength and attractiveness, these hypotheses did not seem too out of place.

Therefore, my opinion is that the paper can be published in its current form.