Hi Charlie and Maya,

  I gave the draft a quick read and added a few suggestions as comments on the pdf. Overall, it looks great. There are a few places you can cut or move to the supplement, though. For RRRs, we focus on the collective, meta-analytic result and not the significance of the individual studies contributing to that estimate. So, I'd ~~cut/move the statistical reporting of the individual lab results.~~ The individual results are summarized effectively in the forest plot already, and the interpretation follows from the combined analysis, not the individual lab findings. I'd like for that to be standard across the papers. Similarly, ~~all new measures should be listed int he method section.~~ The paper introduces several followup questions and items (for moderator analyses) in the results. Describing them in the methods, perhaps under an "additional measures" section, would be more concise, and it would allow for a shorter results description. e.g., In consultation with the original authors, we added several self-report measures to assess how effortful they found the counting task, how important they thought it would be to do well. We used these in follow-up analyses to assess possible reasons for any differences between the RPP protocol and the updated protocol.

 We should also settle on standard, concise language for describing the RPP project so that each paper doesn't have to go into detail on the goals of that project or why ML5 was undertaken. ~~Perhaps a table in each paper listing the possible concerns and what was done to address them in the new protocol?~~ That would simplify the method sections too. More broadly, we should see if we can standardize reporting as much as possible. I like the demographics and lab description table Maya used. Perhaps we can suggest a standard format to all teams?

~~Really minor point: Rather than saying that the original study was the "target" of this replication effort, perhaps say "focus" of this replication effort. Target implies a more negative effort to shoot it down.~~

 When we get to the point of submitting these, they will need to go through the regular submission portal. To make it easier for me to manage them, please ~~insert "ManyLabs5: " at the start of the title~~ for each one. We'll cut that before production, but it'll make it easier for me to find these as they come in and to keep them separate from other submissions. I will assume that all authors in each report will have signed off on the submission before it comes in. When it is submitted, I'll send it to the original authors and to at least one outside reviewer (and I or an AE will give some input as well).

 Let me know if you'd like to discuss any of the specifics of this report or the plans for consistency across reports.

 I think it would be fine to note the proportion of those studies with effects in the predicted direction and the range of observed effect sizes (as well as a comparison to the original effect size if you want).

talk about power based on original sample size in limitations

Great. One other point about the individual study reports - even if the labs know the outcome, it would be great if they could submit a version without the results inserted for the review process. I've found that asking original authors to review the paper absent the results leads to more constructive. If the paper includes the results, they tend to search for ways to find fault rather than evaluating whether the framing and tone are fair. In the long run, it actually speeds the process and makes it more constructive. Make sense?