I thank the authors for their thoughtful responses and edits. Below are additional/remaining comments I have after reviewing the revised manuscript.

1. I appreciate the authors’ housekeeping note in the first paragraph. However, I believe that it can be moved to a footnote so that it does not detract from presenting the core aim of the paper.
2. Concerning the section *Situating the Present Theory*: I suggest that the authors consider reorganizing the section. They bury the most important part of the section—hearing what is being questioned from a question—after a paragraph about the CI. I suggest that the authors start out with this important topic, and just give a brief nod to the CI within this section.
3. It might be worthwhile for the authors to briefly mention some of the research on question types (e.g., Griffiths et al., 2011; Milne & Bull, 1999) in the *Situating the Present Theory* section. This topic is also something that the authors should consider as they draft their Discussion section in the future.
4. Regarding your use of Prolific: Are you using a balanced sample? A representative sample? Neither?
5. On page 22, the authors state that there are 3 outcome levels in Study 1; however, is there not 4 levels (i.e., the authors did not list “I cannot determine what the interviewer wants to know”)?
6. Something for the authors to consider when thinking about the Model 2 predicted results (pg. 25): Resistant subjects may opt for bare utterances over no comment to appear cooperative, and especially so when asked high-worthwhileness questions.
7. I thank the authors for addressing the compound questions and vagueness of some of the scenarios! My remaining comment is for question 2 – the authors might consider how to frame the low-worthwhileness question in a manner that focuses in on time.
8. I very much like the authors incorporation of Scharff into their future Discussion section! However, I still feel that the authors should consider including a little more (not necessarily a whole section) on the literature that backs their hypotheses for Study 2 (differences in utterances between cooperative and resistant subjects). Their hypotheses make sense to me (as I am familiar with the literature), but may appear to have little backing to readers who are not entrenched in the investigative interviewing literature.