The authors have done an exceptional job with revisions to this (already strong) RR, and I appreciate the opportunity to provide additional review to what will no doubt be a noteworthy contribution to the literature.

In general, I am happy with revisions. It is great to see some of the suggested changes, particularly the addition of a third inattentional blindness task (and I am eager to see the results). I also particularly like the revised questioning regarding whether participants were directly searching for an additional object.

Below I have some minor, mostly clarifying, comments. The authors do not need to make additional revisions pertaining to these, since I am of the opinion that the RR is of sufficient quality to accept as is.

Measures of awareness

I still have several (what I consider to be important) disagreements with the authors here, including in the logic they have used and other separate issues with the Nartker (2024) paper. But ultimately, I can agree that these are maybe too much of a side tangent for this project and are of lesser concern here anyway since the purpose is to examine individual differences when the same criterion is applied consistently. More importantly, analyses will be performed and interpreted with consideration given to both the liberal and 'conservative' criteria, so discrepancies in outcomes will be presented and discussed.

Absence of full attention trial

If a full attention trial is implemented not with the requirement that all subjects notice it in this trial, but rather that subjects must notice it on at least one of these trials (inattention, divided attention, or full attention), would this not eliminate the concerns raised? Put another way, if a subject fails to see the item on the inattention or divided attention trial, it leaves open the question whether they can see it at all! If they still do not see it on the full attention trial (when they are directly asked to detect it), I would imagine this subject should then be excluded. On the other hand, if a subject sees it on the divided attention trial, but mind wanders on the full attention trial, then they could still be retained. You could of course achieve the same thing using only the divided attention trial, but since rates of noticing often still vary quite a bit on this trial, to me it still seems a rather simple additional quality check. However, I appreciate the authors expertise here, which I'm ultimately happy to defer to.

Load characterisation

I have no issues with this approach and agree the most appropriate course of action is simply omitting mention of load.

Visual angle

The authors concerns regarding display size and viewing distance is precisely what the previously mentioned virtual chinrest allows one to do - it takes a measure of display size (using the subject's credit card or similar) and a relatively accurate measure of viewing distance (with a visual blind spot test). Still, I won't push this if the authors feel strongly that it is not essential. I can agree that as a source of noise it probably will not impact with this large a sample.