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Thank you for your recent submission to Collabra, “It’s not you, it’s me: Some speakers elicit structural priming more reliably than others.” Since it is a streamlined review, I took a close look at the manuscript, the previous decision letter, and your response to it before deciding whether to send it out for review or not.

First I would like to apologise that it has taken me nearly a month to do this. That is not what I would call “streamlined” and I generally aim to act on submissions far more quickly; I got covid in April and that caused a backlog that I’m only now digging myself out of; I know that’s not a great excuse, so I’ll just say sorry again.

That said, I greatly enjoyed your paper and agree with you and not the previous reviewers that this is interesting as is – sometimes (as now) a paper can make an interesting contribution by pointing out an effect even if it doesn’t also contain all of the answers for why that effect exists. The paper is methodologically solid and addresses an interesting question cleanly, and I have little to add beyond what you have already done.

The one suggestion I would make – and it is a suggestion only, you do not need to do this in order to be accepted – is for a way to address the concern that the individual differences were due to differences in emphasis. First, I think that if this were the case it would still be interesting… but second, one way to at least do a sanity check might be to sample at random say 100 utterances from each of the experimenters and have a coder who was blind to these results code them for how much emphasis they put on the structurally-salient items on a 1-10 scale. Then see if that predicted the individual differences: i.e., whether the experimenters that elicited the most priming also put the most emphasis. My hunch is that they would not, but like I said it would be interesting either way, and more importantly you would be easing any worries that readers like that reviewer might have.

Like I said, it is up to you whether you decide to do this. I understand it might be onerous (depending on your access to undergrads or someone you could get to do this coding well and quickly) and it is not necessary for this to be publishable. It would just make it slightly stronger. If you do this there is no need to run it by me again unless you have any worries or concerns.

Thanks for submitting to Collabra! I enjoyed reading your work.

Andy
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Dear Dr. Perfors,

Thank you for your positive assessment of our manuscript. We did a last check through our manuscript and data, and found a few minor things that needed to be corrected (listed below). We made the corrections, and updated the manuscript and figures as necessary. The changes do not affect the results of the study, and do not change the interpretation of the findings.

Changes:
1 -- We noted a few errors in our coding of the participant responses. These have been corrected.

2 -- We noticed two experimenters whose data should have been excluded for failure to follow instructions. We eliminated these experimenters (leaving a total of 40 experimenters).

3 -- Based on 1 and 2 above, we re-ran our analyses and updated the figures and tables in the manuscript accordingly. We also updated the files on OSF, and changed the links in the manuscript.

4 -- We added a note to the method section to indicate that two of our experimenters did not get through all of their phone calls due to time constraints.

We have uploaded a new version of our manuscript and a new version of Figure 1 that reflects these changes. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Mike Kaschak
Katherine Chia
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Thank you - looks fine to me!

Andy