Dear Dr. Zhang,

Many thanks for inviting us to revise our manuscript. The latest edits are marked using TRACK CHANGES. And our responses are noted below in red font.

Sincerely,

Authors.

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your efforts in this revision and for your patience.

I have received one review from the reviewers and read the revised manuscript myself. Both the reviewer and I (largely) are quite satisfied with this revision. However, I can also see that there were a few remaining issues when reading your response letter to the other reviewers. Therefore, I would like to invite you to revise the proposal.

First, regarding the exploratory analyses, I recommend to leave them out of the stage 1 report. I also think that it would make more sense to treat the optional wager as exploratory given 1) the validity of the response can be questionable and 2) the sample size is uncertain.

Agreed. As stated previously, all exploratory analysis will be tackled at Stage 2. For transparency's sake, we have marked the <u>already included</u> wager measure as an exploratory measure to make the distinction explicit.

Regarding the rationale in the analysis plan, I would recommend you to remove the paragraph for the sake of conciseness.

We have now taken out the rationale paragraph.

Second, I agree with both reviewers that the statement *'Before an interviewer poses any question, it is reasonable for interviewees to assume that the elicitation of complete details is the de facto purpose of an interview.'* is not well supported by previous research and not appropriate to be in the manuscript as it is. If you want to keep it for the introduction of the revision hypothesis, I suggest you to explicitly state this *low

plausibility* by for example 1) replacing 'reasonable' to 'possible' or even 'not impossible' and 2) explicitly state that the research favors the other prediction.

Duly noted. We have now deleted the sentence.

Finally, regarding the appropriateness of scenarios and the disagreement between anonymous reviewer 2 and the authors, I am sympathetic to the reviewer's view. However, I also believe that the authors are well informed by their prior research and piloting. Therefore, I accept the materials as they are but kindly ask the authors to run exploratory analysis looking at the data across different scenarios to address the concern raised by anonymous reviewer 2.

Absolutely, we will examine the data as a function of scenarios to shed light on the disagreement.

Best regards,

Yikang