I appreciate the authors attention to my comments. Below I have reproduced sections of my previous review where I felt the issue wasn't sufficiently addressed (the original text of my review is in regular text and my new text italics). I have deleted comments I felt have been addressed in this revision. At the bottom of all that I have added a few other comments, in italics.

FROM BEFORE: I found the hypotheses to be appropriately precise, and sufficiently conceivable as to be worthy of investigation. That said, I found the wording of "preference for pragmatic correspondence" to be confusing, as the outcome isn't the participants' preferences. A slight rewording would be helpful.
NEW: It seems my comment above may have been misunderstood. What I was trying to say is this hypothesis makes it sound you are asking people for their preferences. That is not the case. So, I would reword this to better reflect what you are measuring. In this study, the primary outcomes is whether their response is scored as pragmatically corresponding more to either the high- or low- specificity question. So, the language should align with that.

FROM BEFORE: On page 6 I was a bit thrown by the paragraph starting "Before an interviewer proposes any question, it is reasonable for the interviewees to assume that the elicitation of complete details is the de facto purpose of the interview." This seems to argue against their first core hypothesis. If this is being presented as an alternate theory that didn't fully come across.
NEW: I appreciate the clarification that this is indeed relevant to the revision hypothesis. But that still doesn't come through in the proposal.

FROM BEFORE: It's not clearly stated that random assignment will be used for the between subjects manipulations (I rather assumed it would be, but it should be stated in the text/procedure).
NEW: I appreciate the authors' attempt to address this, but what I was looking for is a statement that the participants will be randomly assigned to their between subjects condition. That is still not clearly present. The reference to the "5 randomized scenarios" I took to mean the order would be randomized.

FROM BEFORE: It wasn't clear what the "decision making" manipulation check was (in Exclusion Criteria section) but I assume it refers to that "instructional" manipulation check (in Appendix B).
NEW: I appreciate the response, but I think clarity would be greatly improved by simply referring to it as the instruction manipulation check, rather than "decision making" and/or an acronym. There is no need for an acronym.

FROM BEFORE: The textbox prompt "The police-contact wants to know if..." seemed odd to me. Specifically, the word "if." That seems like it would generate answer like "...if I know what brand of drugs the gang is selling" as opposed to answer like "...the gang is selling off

brand oxy" (I assume the latter is the type of answer the authors' are seeking. I realize the authors piloted this, so I'm willing to defer to them on this point. It just seems very odd to me.

NEW: The response to this was very enlightening. I didn't come away from this proposal at all understanding that the desired responses were "They want to know if I know XYZ." I realized that they were not supposed to put what they would actually report to the interviewer, but I still thought actual content was what you wanted. E.g., "They want to know the gang hangs at exit 7F" (Note, I'm not saying that would be what the participate would TELL them; it's clear that's not the goal. But I thought that you wanted the participant to write out the content that they thought that interviewer wanted to hear.) Providing examples of potential responses in the method section would have been wildly helpful to make more concrete what types of responses you are trying to get at. The authors should add such examples.

Now that I understand the intent, two more concerns come to mind. First, it seems like the participants would just repeat back the question. E.g., "The interviewer wants to know if I know anything about the gang's transportation in the park." If participants do that, I imagine the first core hypothesis would be confirmed. But I'm not sure it would be telling us much. Second, if participants are providing responses like "The interviewer wants to know if I know what brand of drugs the gang is selling." Then, this doesn't actually include any of the information (i.e., doesn't mention oxy, off-brand, green-star) to gauge whether the answer was "complete".

FROM BEFORE The authors state that in their past study, and in R1 and R2, pragmatic correspondence was designed to be equivalent to complete details – so high specificity questions specifically request complete details. I thought I understood this, and it made sense to me. But once I got to the Appendices and saw the scenario information and the high and low specificity questions, I had some concerns. In fact, this is my biggest concern regarding the proposed studies.

NEW: I found myself in disagreement with the authors as relates to several points in their response. To ensure my understanding of their position is clear, I will start with that, in case I have misunderstood.

Pragmatic correspondence (with the high specificity question) was designed to be equivalent to complete details. Using the first scenario, the authors argue that in order to provide the information corresponding with "Have you spotting the exact location at the park where KET22 deals drugs?" the participants need to mention all the information (edge of the park; discreet; exit 7F) in order for "Exit 7F" to be meaningful. I believe I understand what the authors are saying (though I disagree as explained below), though I'm not entirely sure when looking at each scenario what the 3 relevant details are. E.g., for the scenario about the contents of interactions, is the timing considered part of the complete info? Is the fact that it was an argument part of the complete info?

First, I just don't agree with the authors. The idea is that the high specificity question should (if their hypothesis is correct) create an expectation that a specific detail is sought, as per Figure 1. For this question the "specific detail" is the location. And the location is Exit 7F. The authors seem to be arguing, e.g., to give someone the location of your home, you'd have

to mention not only the street and the house number, but also the contextual information that it's on a quiet tree lined street. Or, to use the example in Figure 1, to provide complete information it would be necessary to say not just 16:00 but also, in the evenings, after work. But that is inconsistent with Figure 1.

Second, in line with my comment above, if participants provide responses like "...if I know where in the park they deal" or "...if the gang deals in a specific spot in the park" – I don't see how that has anything to do with whether participants provide "complete" information, however that's defined.

FROM BEFORE: I also have concerns with the fact that scenarios contain such limited information. To me this makes it reasonably easy for all participants to choose to provide all information. Unless I'm missing something, it seems like participants don't even need to be presented with any information. They could just be presented with questions and ask what information they think the interviewer would want them to find out. This is less leading as there are many potential options, not a couple details. Indeed, some of the low specificity questions are so vague that there are a huge number of details that an interviewee might suggest the interviewer was interested in, if they were not confined to 2 or 3 pieces of information. (e.g., "*Have you discovered anything about the gang's narcotics sales lately?:* This could be getting at whether sales good or bad; is one product selling better than another; sales are initiated via text messages; sales are primarily conducted by person X and person Y). As the proposed studies are more of an initial preliminary test, this is less of a concern than the previous point I made, but something to consider moving forward.

NEW: I'm not particularly persuaded by the authors response. I think my phrasing threw my point off a bit when I mentioned what the interviewer "would want to know." Perhaps a better example to make my point would be, what if there were a scenario where the participant was not able to learn anything that week, but the interviewer still asked a question. Much like someone could still make a judgment that the interviewer wanted to know about e.g., a bomb design, even if they didn't remember the answer, they could make a judgment that the interviewer wanted to know about a bomb design even if they didn't know anything about the bomb. Or, another example, what if there were a scenario where what they learned wasn't relevant to the question asked (they learned about where the bomb would be detonated, but not its design), the same basic logic would apply. They could make an assessment of the interviewer's goal despite not having relevant information. And then it wouldn't limit them to the contents of what they know (since they shouldn't be limiting their understanding of what the interviewer wants to know to the contents of what they know, as those things may or may not overlap). And, in line with previous comments, if responses like "the interviewer wants to know if I know about the bomb design" are the goal, then what does the interviewee's knowledge have to do with anything? All that said, since this is a preliminary test, I'll let it go. But I feel like what can be learned using the current design is fairly limited.

FROM BEFORE: The "disposition" manipulation was introduced in such a way on page 8 that I didn't realize it was a manipulation. I thought at first that participants could choose their disposition (also the term disposition was not introduced at that time, so it took me by surprise later).
NEW: The introduction disposition as a manipulation is much clearer, thank you. That said, it still comes out of nowhere. There should be some explanation of why this variable is there / what purpose is serves.

FROM BEFORE: Coding: I was quite confused here. I think part of the is that perhaps where the authors said "choice' they really intended to say "response." If that is the case, I think I understand what the authors are proposing, but, it doesn't quite make sense to me. I think this is related to my major concern above. My understanding is that the authors are proposing that coder should code more "complete" answer on the "high specificity" side of the scale. But that assumes that the high specificity questions really were in fact seeking complete details. Which, as I note above, I don't think they (all) are.
NEW: In line with several points above, I don't really understand how this coding will work if the responses provided won't actually provide content and essentially repeat the question (perhaps some will and some won't?). Examples of a few potential response and how they might be coded would be exceedingly helpful. What would be an example of a response worthy of a score of +100 and -100? How would "…if I know the exact location where they deal" (which is basically repeating the question) score relative to "…if I know they deal at exit 7F" ? As the questions were piloted I assume the authors have some sense of what kind of answers they will get.
Also, will it be possible to catch if people are simply repeating the exact wording of the question?

Other new comments:

Pg 5: It would be helpful to give a bit more elaboration on the statement "this honing process can indirectly affect whether an interviewee cooperates or resists" – just a brief example would help clarify the thinking here

Figure 1: I think it's a stretch to say this is showing the mechanism. It's more showing the basic procedure and the first core hypothesis. What the actual honing process/mechanism is, is not specified. The figure is really just showing the authors expect that if you ask for the specific time, people think you just want to know the specific time, and if you don't specify a specific time in the question, people don't make that assumption.

To make more clear that you're not interested in memory, you could note early on that in your studies the content is available to the participants, so there is no memory aspect (and emphasize that point in the procedure.)

Why did Replication 1 use 6 scenarios and Replication 2 use 5?