* 2A. Whether the data are able to test the authors’ proposed hypotheses (or answer the proposed research question) by passing the approved outcome-neutral criteria, such as absence of floor and ceiling effects or success of positive controls or other quality checks.

Yes, the data are able to test the author’s proposed hypotheses. For example, to strengthen their results for H2, they added equivalence testing (p. 17, l. 446). Regarding H3, only 31 participants out of 40 filled in the Mini-TQ and they state that they “correlated the individual tinnitus distress values with the mean decoding accuracy of each individual in the previously analyzed pre-stimulus interval.” (p. 17, ll. 450-452). For the reader, it is unclear if you matched the Mini-TQ data for these specific 31 subjects. Could you clarify this and/or add some more detail here?

* 2B. Whether the introduction, rationale and stated hypotheses (where applicable) are the same as the approved Stage 1 submission. This can be readily assessed by referring to the [**tracked-changes manuscript supplied by the authors**.](https://osf.io/download/apk2h/)

Yes, the introduction, rationale and hypothesis were identical to the approved Stage 1 after inspecting the tracked-changes manuscript. The only changes made were due to the tense used.

* 2C. Whether the authors adhered precisely to the registered study procedures.

Overall yes, some small adjustments were made, i.e.., p.17, l. 431, for the time window assessed.

* 2D. Where applicable, whether any unregistered exploratory analyses are justified, methodologically sound, and informative.

Indeed, there were exploratory analyses added, see the section “Exploratory results”. This was done to compare the current results with the results of Partyka et al. (2019). In my opinion, these elaborations add to the quality of the paper.

* 2E. Whether the authors’ conclusions are justified given the evidence.

Yes, the conclusions are justified.