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This manuscript examines whether burgeoning interest in replication that is particularly strong in medicine, life sciences, and social sciences should extend to the humanities. For papers of this form, my evaluation criteria are less on whether I agree with the arguments and more on whether the arguments are well-made and whether the discussion would be a scholarly advance on an important issue. For me, the answer is clearly yes. This paper is a timely piece and tackles an important topic. I have witnessed or participated in informal debates about whether replication, preregistration, and other forms of open scholarship should extend to the humanities, but this is the first formal treatment of the question that I have seen for replication. I also appreciated the clear specification of terms. It is very easy to recommend publication.

One substantive concern: I have a major philosophical disagreement with this claim: "What these examples show, is that - both in the humanities and the sciences - the failure to replicate a study counts against that study only if the method and relevant background premises used in the replication study are agreed upon as valid by the authors of the original study." (and the parts immediately following). If we are aspiring to "truth" then the methods to pursue that truth should not be reliant on what the originator of the claim says is fair to critique.Crudely, what happens when the original author is dead? More generally, accepting the claim that appropriate replication *requires* agreement by the original authors quickly leads to a conclusion that truth claims are socially constructed. I recognize that tackling this issue opens up some core debates in the humanities (and elsewhere) in social constructivism, the role of the perceiver in knowledge acquisition, and other issues that this paper is not likely to address comprehensively. However, it may be wise to address this a bit more to at least nod to these areas of challenge for replication in the humanities. Right now, the section makes this assertion as if it is a non-controversial point.

One minor point: "However, this point is not relevant for the issue of replication: if there are ways to uncover knowledge about objects with value and meaning and even about those aspects of those objects that concern value and meaning (if this is not possible, then the humanities are in trouble in general, independently of the issue of replication), then it is possible to do so multiple times for the same or similar objects, and thus, to carry out a replication study." too much to unpack here. Split up into separate statements. A bit more elaboration is needed here—the objection is not fully answered.
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