

Dear Moin,

Thank you for your decision letter and the reviews. I am deeply grateful to all involved because I am well aware that this is a substantial paper which would have made a lot of work for everyone. Here are my replies to the points in your letter.

1. A list of eligible journals was included in the Stage 1 acceptance email sent to me on Oct. 22nd 2023. Of those in the list, my first choice for publication would be the Royal Society Open Science Journal, but I'm not sure if my employers will pay the fee for that journal. My second choice would be the Journal of Cognition, but that also has a substantial fee. I shall investigate what financial support might be available. Neither journal has a word limit so I am hoping that the full version could be published in either of them, and that is the version I am submitting. I have prepared a reduced version with as much as possible moved to a Supplementary Materials document, but even the reduced version is 80 pages long and I can't see how to make further significant reductions. For most of the experiments there are important issues relating to the hypotheses and design of the experiment that simply have to be covered adequately, and much the same applies to the discussion sections - I cannot really relegate those to the supplementary materials. Anyway, I hope that either of my preferred journals would accept the full version.

2. I have added some figures, mainly for the more visually immediate results such as those of Experiment 1. However it would not be possible to represent all of the results in graphs because there would be more than 40 of them. Length is already a concern for this manuscript and every figure adds more to the length, so partly for that reason I have kept the number of figures to a minimum. I hope this will be acceptable.

3. This has been done. With 14 experiments there isn't room in the abstract to talk about all of them but I have added a couple of highlights that I hope will encourage readers to investigate the paper.

4. Tables 1, 2, 3, and 44 (formerly 45) are now single-spaced as requested. However I don't understand the comment about clear delineation of columns and am not sure what I can do about it. The tables basically have lines of text in them so not much in the way of columns can be put in. Could you explain what you want, please?

5. This has been done.

Maxine Sherman's review

The reviewer asks for graphical depictions of hypothesised patterns. Here too, adding such figures for all of the experiments would greatly increase the length of the paper and, in my opinion, this would not be justified. Almost all of the figures would be very schematic because only the direction of a hypothesised difference could be given, and I think this would not be satisfactory. I have added some graphs for a few of the results that have immediate visual appeal and readability (see experiments 1, 4, 5, 11, 12, and 13).

On the numbered points at the start of the decision letter, data are available on OSF and can be accessed using the link in the manuscript. I hope that is O.K. Details on experimental procedures are described comprehensively in the manuscript and methods are also available on OSF. I have added the conflict of interest disclosure to the manuscript.

One more question. The design plan is still in the manuscript. This was a requirement for stage 1 submission but I just wanted to ask whether it should still be there in the final version or whether it should now be removed?

Yours sincerely,

Peter White