

## Minor Revision

*Thank you for your revision. The exact analyses and conclusions still need to be clearer for row 1 of the design table. I believe you are interested in the simple effects of stimulus for each condition. The presence or absence of an interaction seems irrelevant to your conclusion; and a main effect of stimulus is not fully informative - right? Why not pre-register just two tests: The simple effect of stimulus (oddball vs baseline) for each condition (high vs low odd ball). If you do this, power should be calculated for those tests (even if it is not what one would ideally want, it should be known). If you fail to get evidence for any one, it is unclear you expect modulation of oscillations for the corresponding condition. You say "we still COULD get modulations if there is a dissociation". Yes, you could. But you also have an out, if you don't get modulations: The theory that there will be modulations is not weakened because why SHOULD there be modulations if there was no difference in perception? So I would delete the prevarication. If you don't find both simple effects, the test is simply not a severe one of the theory there will be modulations. By second test, do you mean second visit?*

We thank the recommender for his prompt response and constructive feedback. We agree that in this specific case, the use of two separate linear mixed models testing for the effect of stimulus (oddball vs baseline) on the ratings in either the high oddball condition (model 1) or the low oddball condition (model 2) might be a more efficient way to probe the results. The first row of the hypothesis table, section 2.8.1 (p. 15) as well as the explanation of the sample size rationale (p. 27) have been adapted accordingly.

It seems that the phrasing of the previous response regarding the meaning of a negative result in row one of the hypothesis table has not been clear, for which we would like to apologize. Based on our main hypothesis, if we fail to get evidence for a difference between baseline and oddball ratings in one of the conditions, we do not expect to find a modulation of ongoing oscillations at the frequency of stimulation of the corresponding oddball ( $FoS_{\text{oddball}}$ ). This has now been clarified in the hypothesis table.

The "second test" was referring to the post-hoc assessment of significant interactions found in the LMM (i.e. pairwise comparisons). Since we removed the interaction, we have also removed the sentence you were referring to.

We hope that the issues regarding the first row of the hypothesis table have now been sufficiently elucidated and we are looking forward to being able to start the data acquisition for this investigation soon.