Dear Prof. Dienes,

We like to once more express our appreciation for all the feedback you and the reviewers have provided, which have led to this improved version of our registered report.

We have now addressed the final minor comments you have raised, as we present below. Your comments are presented in **bold font**, followed by our response.

1) At the end of the introduction you say ", exploratory analyses will investigate any temporal differences between the proposed timing conditions." Delete this clause, because by declaring in advance what you will explore, it muddies the waters concerning the distinction between non-preregistered and preregistered analyses. That is, at Stage 1, one does not mention analyses that will be exploratory.

This sentence has been removed in the updated version.

2) Thank you for your new simulations. Just be clearer about the results both in the text and the design table; namely, say when H1 is assumed (g = 0.58 etc), what proportion of B's are > 3 and also < 1/3; and when H0 is assume, what proportion of B's are > 3 and < 1/3.

Thank you for bringing the need for this clarification to our attention. We have now elaborated in our simulation both in our design table (Table 1, page 32) and in the text, in page 20, paragraph 1, provided also below:

"In order to confirm the adequacy of our proposed sample size, we simulated each of our registered t-tests 10,000 times. The simulation results indicated that for the outcome neutral condition a BF > 3 or BF < 1/3 was evident in 85% of the simulations. Specifically, assuming the alternative hypothesis is true for the outcome neutral condition with an expected effect size g = 0.58, a BF > 3 (median BF = 12.2 x 10^6) was generated in 100% of the simulations, while assuming the null hypothesis is true (g = 0), a BF < 1/3 (median BF = 0.252) was produced in 70% of the simulations. For the encoding condition a BF > 3 or BF < 1/3 was evident in 90% of the simulation. In detail, assuming the alternative hypothesis is true in the encoding condition (g = 0.8), the simulation yielded a BF > 3 (median BF = 19.1 x 10^7) in 100% of the simulations, and assuming the null hypothesis is true (g = 0), a BF < 1/3 (median BF = 0.189) was evident in 80% of the simulations. Lastly a BF > 3 or BF < 1/3 was evident in 81% of the simulations for the maintenance condition, where 100% of the simulations yielded a BF > 3 (median BF = 23.3 x 10^6), assuming the alternative hypothesis is true (g = 0.5), and 63% of the simulations yielded a BF < 1/3 (median BF = 0.285), assuming the null hypothesis (g = 0) is true. The results of these simulations are consistent with previous work suggesting that a total of 40 participants is adequate to provide a BF > 3 or BF < 1/3 with a proportion of at least 80% (Palfi & Dienes, 2019)."