

Antwortschreiben an Reviewer:innen

Hier werden Textbausteine für ein englisches Antwortschreiben an den/die Reviewer:in zur Verfügung gestellt. Kommentare der Reviewer:innen sind normal gedruckt; die Antwort sind jeweils kursiv gesetzt.

»We thank the editor and two reviewers for their positive feedback, insightful comments, and constructive suggestions, which we address point-by-point below. All changes to the manuscript are marked in blue.

Response to Reviewer #1

In this paper the authors investigate ... This topic is important and the paper contains very interesting results. I believe that some additional analyses are needed to fully convince the reader that ... I make specific suggestions below in order to demonstrate a causal relationship between ...

We are pleased to read the reviewer's overall positive assessment. We have conducted additional analyses and outline our responses point-by-point below.

Major comments:

1. Figure 6 presents interesting results. However, this correlation could be due to ... and it is not clear to me if there is a causal relationship with ...

We agree with the reviewer that it is possible that ... To address this potential problem, we conducted additional analyses now reported on p. x, para. x. In brief, these analyses show ...

2. Do you think that the well-known finding that ... (which is well documented in the literature) ... might be useful in interpreting ... ? It would be nice to hear the authors thoughts on this.

This is an interesting suggestion and a valid alternative interpretation of the finding that We now discuss a potential link with ... and also mention ... in this context [Discussion, p. x, para. x].

Minor comments:

3. The reference on line 30 ... is wrong. This is referring to

We removed the reference from the Introduction [p. x, l. x].

4. lines 123-124 Methods. Were these 40 trials performed in one block or did the authors divide them into different blocks? Was there a practice run to make sure that the participants understood what was asked from them?

In response to the first point raised: We have clarified the order of experiments (1 block of 40 trials followed by ...) in Methods [p. x-x, l. x-x]. In response to the second point: We decided to run the ... task first so participants could get familiar with the setup. We did not run an additional training task for the ... task, but the experimenter verbally confirmed that participants had understood the task.

5. In the results section the authors mention that they used two parameters that »were indicative of task performance and were related to successful ...«. Why did the authors choose the percentage of ... and not the actual ... which would also relate to ...?

We agree that the percentage of ... is only one possible choice. We now also report ... [Results, p. x, para. x to p. x, para. x]. In brief, we find that No such relationship was found for

Line 279: »Fig. 5B« should probably be replaced with »Fig. 6B«.

Fixed [p. x, l. x].

Response to Reviewer #2:

Major comments:

1. Most importantly, the degree to which this study advances the field is not clear. To their credit, in the Discussion the authors clearly contextualize their results within the existing literature, including discussing how their results are consistent with previous studies. However, they are less clear about how they extend the results of previous studies and how that extension is significant.

We agree with the reviewer that we were not clear enough in highlighting how this study advances the field. We now state the goals of our study more explicitly. Briefly, the main focus of the paper is on Even though ... is known, it is not yet well understood under which task and stimulus condition The current study contributes to this understanding and has the potential to ultimately enable ... [Introduction, p. x para. x].

2. Another major issue I have with the manuscript concerns the conceptual framing of the findings. The authors refer to ..., but ... If the terms »...« and »...« were removed from the manuscript entirely, the experiment and results would be more comprehensible. I judge that if the manuscript were streamlined by removing this extraneous text, its ultimate impact would not suffer and may improve.

We found the reviewer's comment interesting and thought-provoking. It stimulated many discussions in the lab. After much deliberation we decided to not forego use of the term »...« entirely. We did, however, make the following changes to the manuscript: a new paragraph in the Introduction [p. x, para. x] now explains our use of terminology. Throughout the Methods section, we now use the term »...«.

3. Finally, the authors never analyze ... behavior aligned on ...; it is not clear why this is the case, since this can provide direct information about ... (a point which the present paper only »approximates«).

We are not sure we understand this comment. Whereas it would be possible to analyze ... relative to ..., this is not possible To be able to compare ... with ... (the main goal of the study) we analysed ..., as already outlined in Results [p. x, para. x].