

Dear Dr. Evans,

Thank you again for your feedback on our manuscript, “Implicit Ideologies: Do Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation Predict Implicit Attitudes?” We’d also like to thank the reviewers again for the helpful advice and positive feedback they’ve given our manuscript. We’ve addressed the few remaining comments from Reviewer 1 below. Hopefully this clears up any remaining issues but we are happy to discuss further if needed.

Anonymous Reviewer 1

The power analysis described on page 19 is not a sensitivity (what is the minimum detectable effect size given N, alpha, and power) but a post hoc analysis (what is the power to detect a specific effect size, with a given alpha and N). However, I suggest you perform a sensitivity analysis, as it could be more informative (Perugini et al., 2018 <https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.181>).

Thanks to the reviewer’s comments, we realised that our original description of the power analysis was unclear. We had, in fact, planned to perform a sensitivity analysis and so we’ve now updated the description (bottom of page 19 - beginning of page 20) to more clearly explain and cite this. Thank you for the feedback!

Minor comments:

-Table 1 row 5. Consider indicating in the notes that “status quo” does not have a counterpart. It is explained only later in the manuscript.

-Notes 2 on page 15. “A two-stage approach (Yuan & Lu, 2008) is preferable in for the Ideology 2.0...” Please, remove “in.”

-Notes 3 on page 19. “the “SSpower()” function provided by the “semTools” package in R (CITE).” Insert proper citation.

-Page 19, last row. “Mimumum” is misspelled.

We’ve fixed or removed these errors.