I liked reading the manuscript. The experiments were well designed and reported and the limitations of the design were reported as well. The statistical tests seem appropriate for the study. The only challenge I had was that I did not understand the data presentation - at all, since it was not clear and extremely confusing as to what was being presented. Due to this, I could not review the manuscript in depth. Please address my comments below and CLEARLY label the data across rounds, endowments and treatments in your resubmission.

1.I have trouble deciphering the data presented in the manuscript. Is Table 1, the average across all 4 rounds? If yes, please state so. If not, which round is this data from? Please present standard deviations for each average. If you have averaged data from all 4 rounds into Table 1, where is the data for each round (for the 3 endowments and 3 treatments)? Is this data presented in Figure 1 ? The bars in Figure 1 do not correspond with the data in Table 1. Do the four columns for each treatment in Figure 1 represent the data from 4 rounds? Are these from high/middle or low endowments? or are these for average endowment? If yes, please present this column graph with error bars depicting either the range or standard deviation (state which in the legend). Where is the legend for the Figure?

2.Can you present a Table with all four rounds of data across each endowment category and treatment, CLEARLY labeling what the data is showing? Please be sure to present standard deviations as well. Since you only had 3 participants per group, it may be helpful to the reader if you can attach the raw data as a supplemental file to the manuscript (as an excel file perhaps).

3.Please make sure to make proper Tables using the software and not input data in single columns in the text itself.

I will be happy to contine review of this manuscript once these comments are addressed.

_____

Dear Reviewer,
Thank you for your comments on the manuscript.
All the comments on data presentation were addressed. I've addressed point #3, on the data tables' formatting. Each table cell has a boundary now.
For point #1, table 1 (now table 5 in the revised manuscript) shows the average contribution across all 4 rounds, and that is made clear in the heading of the table in the revised manuscript. Standard deviations for all averages have also been added to the tables. Figure 1 was supposed to present the average proportion of endowments contributed from rounds 1-4: more specifically, the average of all endowment types' relative contribution. Yes, each bar represents one round, and each cluster of bars represent a treatment. This is made clear in a newly added figure legend now. I've also added error bars (±1 SD) to the figure, and mentioned it in the legend.
For point #2, the data for each round has been separately placed into tables 1-4 in the new manuscript (for each combination of endowment and treatment). Additionally, I've attached an excel file with the raw data of every decision made by participants, as well as their endowment during the round that a decision was made.
Sincerely,
Author

_____

Thank you for addressing my comments. Before I accept this paper, I would like to make sure that

1.there was no difference between 1 and 2 or 1 and 3. (However, I would like you to double check whether this is indeed true for 1 and 3.

2.More cooperation was evidenced for treatment 2 (effort) than for treatment 3 (luck). This means that the REVERSE of hypothesis 2 is true.

Please check the attached file to make sure that I have captured your results correctly. Please read thoroughly.

_____

1. It's true for both comparisons with respective p values of 0.602 in comparing treatments 1 and 2, and 0.130 in comparing treatments 1 and 3.
2. Yes. Thats representative of the study findings.

   Thank you for your time.

_____

Thank you for addressing my comments. Accepted.