In their pre-registered report “How Intelligence Interviewees Mentally Identify Relevant Information,” the authors tackle a very pertinent question within the investigative interviewing literature; namely, how interviewer questions impact interviewees’ mental designation of information items.

I believe that the authors do well in discussing the importance of the topic and the related theory, as well as have developed a good procedure to test their postulations. However, there are some concerns that I have, primarily with their methodology.

1. Considering that the authors make hypotheses concerning resistant interviewees, I would like to see them more extensively link the counter-interrogation literature to their hypotheses (especially in regards to Study 2). For example, I would argue that consideration of theory underlying the Strategic Use of Evidence (SUE) would be important to consider (e.g., interviewees think about what information an interviewer has and uses their predictions to guide their interview strategies).
2. The authors should consider including a sensitivity analysis for their restricted *N* of 300.
3. Concerning their design (p. 17), the authors should clarify that it is a between-subjects design. Additionally, the authors should reiterate what the primary outcome variables are (which highlights the key distinction between Studies 1 & 2).
4. What is the authors’ reasoning for presenting information items individually instead as part of a narrative (which would, arguably, increase the ecologically validity of the study)? By presenting items individually, the authors are presumably making an initial decision for participants concerning which information out of a narrative to hone in on (and this is especially so for the low-worthwhileness questions), thereby undermining, to some extent, the premise of their study.
5. What is the authors’ reason for including the wager question? Also, is this a continuous variable, or dichotomous variable?
6. Have the authors considered enhancing participants’ motivation? For example, the authors could tell participants that their final payout is dependent on: how well they predict what the interviewer is looking for (Study 1); or how effective they are at demonstrating their innocence (Study 2)?
7. What is the reason for the authors allowing participants to miss 2 (instead of only 1) of the control questions? These seem like *extremely* straight-forward questions, making me wonder whether an allowance of 2 misses is too lenient.
8. This is related to my comment above about the wager variable – why are the authors running a logistic regression? I assumed the variable was continuous (0-100%). If it’s not, the authors should clarify this.
9. I am curious about the authors’ decision to frame the responses to the disposition manipulation check as they did (p. 1 of the Appendices). I can see a resistant subject answering with (-1), (0), or (1), which I do not believe that any of those answers would indicate that the participant did not understand the instructions. For example, the resistant subject may be motivated to be viewed as cooperative, and therefore adopt the strategy of revealing some information, or use a mix of commission and omission strategies.

Furthermore, I can see a cooperative subject answering with (1) or (2), as they may be fearful of something like gang retaliation, which may therefore lend to a motivation to resist.

Have the authors considered these possibilities? I suggest that the authors include a more concrete manipulation check to base exclusions on.

1. I would advise against including compound questions (e.g., Question #7), as such questions will presumably require subjects making multiple information designations instead of just one.

1. Some of the low-worthwhileness questions seem overly vague in relation to the piece of information they are paired with (e.g., Question #1), as compared to others (e.g., Question #2). I suggest that the authors consider more specific low-worthwhileness questions across the board (e.g., as they used with Question #2).

To elaborate, the low-worthwhileness question for #1 would give very little (if any) indication that the interviewer is looking for information about the *type* of drug the gang is selling. However, with Question #2, the interviewer is arguably giving more indication what they are looking for (i.e., something about the drug deals specifically), while still being vague enough to be in line with the manipulation. Thus, as it stands, the extent to which a question demonstrates low-worthwhileness is confounded with the piece of information.