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Thank you for your Stage 2 submission of your manuscript, “The Influence of Utterance-Related Factors on the Use of Direct and Indirect Speech.” I have sent it to two of the same reviewers who saw the Stage 1 version and also taken a close look myself. I am happy to provisionally accept it. That said, I have a few suggestions that should be taken care of so I am calling this a “Revise and Resubmit” so that it’s easy to do this in the system. I will have a look at them myself before formally accepting but will not pass it back to the reviewers unless something very unexpected occurs.

1. I looked at the code for the analyses on OSF and it appears to me that there was a typo in supportingfile.R and all of the summary() functions involved model2, which was based on 80 participants rather than 250. I can’t be sure because it did not include the outputs of the analyses but could you please double-check that you have reported the results of all 250 participants? (Including the output of the tests in the OSF would be nice too). If you have reported the wrong ones, please modify the paper accordingly.
2. The guidelines for Registered Reports require that you report exact p values, effect sizes, and 95% confidence intervals for all inferential tests using the Neyman-Pearson approach. This should be added to Table 1 where appropriate. I also agree with the reviewer who suggested adding a summary of the random effects.
3. Finally, I would have appreciated a short explanation of the results after the table providing an interpretation of them. For instance I can see from it that utterance type influenced the use of direct and indirect speech but could you explain how to interpret the 1.31 value in terms of the question (is it that Main Clause Phenomena where N times more likely to be direct speech?). Similar questions for other significant parameters. (You can move some of the first paragraph of the discussion to the results and add those things if that is easier).
4. One of the reviewers mentioned their curiosity about the lack of effect of facial expression. This is not required for acceptance, but you might consider adding something to the discussion addressing this.

Thank you for your submission, and I look forward to seeing a version with these corrections.

Andrew Perfors

# Reviewer 1

##### Open response questions

### Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

The authors addressed most of the points I raised in my previous review.

I am most curious about the effects (or lack thereof) of facial expression. I also wonder whether facial expression and voice are independent of each other, or if there might be interaction effects. Facial expression valency is also culturally coded, with a lot of individual variation. I’d be curious to see if there was a baseline of facial expression for the subjects and if their facial expression while transmitting the story changed significantly, for different kinds of narrations (perhaps, like the authors mention, including more direct speech in dialogue).

Overall I found the paper interesting and worthwhile, and recommend it for publication.

##### Rating scale questions

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |

# Reviewer 2

##### Open response questions

### Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

This is a review of the second stage of, “The Influence of Utterance-Related Factors on the Use of Direct and Indirect Speech.”

I think this manuscript turned out quite nicely, and would be happy to see it published. The statistical evidence provided by the results of the mixed effects logistic model is good and the conclusions drawn are appropriate. The only thing I would suggest is to add to table 1 a summary of the random effects. For example, what is their estimated SD, i.e., how much variability is there among participants and items? This could be useful information for anyone planning a followup study.

Here are the criteria specific to stage 2 reports:

Whether the data are able to test the authors’ proposed hypotheses by passing the approved outcome-neutral criteria (such as absence of floor and ceiling effects or success of positive controls)
Yes.

Whether the Introduction, rationale and stated hypotheses are the same as the approved Stage 1 submission (required)
Yes.

Whether the authors adhered to the registered experimental procedures
Yes.

Whether any unregistered exploratory analyses added by the authors are justified, methodologically sound, and informative
N/A

Whether the authors’ conclusions are justified given the data
Yes.

##### Rating scale questions

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |

**Author Response**
Feb 15, 2022

Dear Prof. Perfors,

 We would like to thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript and for the valuable comments. We have tried to address the questions as best as we could below and marked the revised content in blue color.

1. I looked at the code for the analyses on OSF and it appears to me that there was a typo in supportingfile.R and all of the summary() functions involved model2, which was based on 80 participants rather than 250. I can’t be sure because it did not include the outputs of the analyses but could you please double-check that you have reported the results of all 250 participants? (Including the output of the tests in the OSF would be nice too). If you have reported the wrong ones, please modify the paper accordingly.

Author response: Thank you for this comment. We uploaded a new Supporting file 1. R to the pre-registered page on OSF. The new file contains correct R scripts and the output of the tests.

1. The guidelines for Registered Reports require that you report exact p values, effect sizes, and 95% confidence intervals for all inferential tests using the Neyman-Pearson approach. This should be added to Table 1 where appropriate. I also agree with the reviewer who suggested adding a summary of the random effects.

Author Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We added the 95% confidence intervals to Table 1. The p values, effect sizes, and random effects summary can be found on Page 13 and Page 14 (marked in blue).

1. Finally, I would have appreciated a short explanation of the results after the table providing an interpretation of them. For instance I can see from it that utterance type influenced the use of direct and indirect speech but could you explain how to interpret the 1.31 value in terms of the question (is it that Main Clause Phenomena where N times more likely to be direct speech?). Similar questions for other significant parameters. (You can move some of the first paragraph of the discussion to the results and add those things if that is easier).

Author response: We added explanations for both the significant and non-significant factors. There are on P13 (Line 21-Line23) and P14 (Line 1-Line4).

1. One of the reviewers mentioned their curiosity about the lack of effect of facial expression. This is not required for acceptance, but you might consider adding something to the discussion addressing this.

Author response: This is an interesting suggestion. We read several papers trying to find out why there was no effect facial expression. However, based on the available literature and evidence, we can not come up with an explanation for the lack of effect of facial expression. The quotation of non-verbal information is highly flexible. As for how much non-verbal information and from which modality the information is quoted is still open to investigation. We can not give an answer based on the available evidence from previous studies.

Thank you again for the chance to revise our work and the helpful comments from you and all the reviewers.

Best regards,

Author

**Editor Final Decision:** Accept

March 8, 2022

Thank you for your thorough response to my comments on the previous submission. I am pleased with the changes and am happy to accept the paper!