Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit my manuscript that presents goal sampling theory as a simple extension of TMT. The reviewer was clear that the paper required a major reorganization to (1) better introduce the crucial aspects of the paper, (2) define important concepts and keep the cited literature relevant to the topics discussed, and (3) make it more obvious how GST differs from TMT. I have updated the document in response to the reviewer comments. All changes to the manuscript are highlighted in blue (although, of course, you cannot see material that was removed). Please find my point by point responses below, and again thank you for taking the time to help me improve this manuscript.

**Reviewer Comments**

**1**

“A simple, dynamic extension of Temporal Motivation Theory (TMT)” presents a mathematical model of individual level decision making. The narrative motivates the model as the process an employee would use to determine what to work on or what goals to focus on. The author’s intent is to build on TMT, which already considers the utility function of the actor, along with hyperbolic discounting, expectancy theory, cumulative prospect theory and need theory, by considering the “environment” when sampling when sampling options and comparing prior payoffs. This is a good idea. That the TMT model does not consider context is a weakness. What is unclear is what exactly Goal Sampling is modeling and how it works. The issue is a function of the writing and the selection of examples (and literature) used throughout the manuscript. There were so many tangents and explanations sprinkled through the text that it was difficult to keep straight the contribution of the Goal Sampling and what was unique to this model.

A major reorganization would go far in making this paper more clear. For instance, what is meant by “environment” was not well defined and the literature review that pertained to environment seemed like a tangent (top of page 6). The author should be careful to clearly and explicitly define all concepts and stick to only literature that relates to the model. There must be literature related to environment or context in decision making more relevant than the animal examples used. While reading this section I actually wondered if maybe the author intended for environment to mean something other than situational environment.

**Response**

Thank you for the recommendation and opportunity to make the paper more clear. After going back through the paper, I agree that my original discussion of the environment was confusing. I have significantly updated and trimmed the introduction to the environment section so that only material that directly relates to the paper is discussed. This new material begins at the bottom of page 8.

Another note is that the environment is a major piece I wanted to incorporate, but it wasn't the only aspect I wanted to focus on. In the prior paper, I introduced the environment first. This time, I pushed the environment section down to emphasize other features first -- hopefully doing so improved clarity.

You also mentioned that it was difficult to keep straight the contribution of goal sampling. I now begin the manuscript by discussing important features of goal choice theories, how TMT covers some but not all of those aspects, and use that framework as a backdrop for the rest of the paper. My hope is that this initial framing at the start of the paper will make it more clear what is unique about the goal sampling model. This new piece is incorporated on page 4.

**2**

The author’s strategy to review TMT before discussing Goal Sampling is a good idea. The issue is that it does not go far enough and the way it is done is confusing. Readers of the Journal of Mathematical Sociology may not be familiar with TMT or literature that surrounds it, or notation used to describe models. It is not that the literature is not covered, but that it is covered in a very non-linear manner. The TMT model has many elements, many of which are also elements of other approaches. It might be more effective if the author just introduce each feature he feels pertain to his question, cover these elements, mention that TMT covers many, but fails to consider environment, and then demonstrate how the TMT model can be extended to include this new consideration.

**Response**

This is a very good suggestion. Following the introduction, the paper now gets right into important features for goal choice and how TMT covers some but not all of those features (see page 4). The rest of the paper is then framed around satisfying the remaining criteria. I believe this simple suggestion went a long way to improve the clarity of the paper, I hope you agree.

**3**

It would also be very useful if the author would demonstrate the benefit of the Goal Sampling model with a comparison to TMT.

**Response**

Great idea. The discussion section now includes an example where both TMT and GST are compared to more clearly demonstrate their differences.

**4**

Related to this, the examples selected often did not work well to clarify ideas. Part of the issue is that there are many different illustrations and examples. A more effective approach might be to select a motivating example and use that one example to illustrate the benefit of each model element.

**Response**

The suggestions above, in my opinion, went a long way to improve the paper's clarity. It's actually my preference to use many different illustrations rather than one consistent example throughout -- I think it gives the reader a chance to see the ideas from many angles. My hope is that by incorporating your earlier suggestions this one becomes less of an issue.

**5**

One final issue is relevance to sociology. The motivating example is related to a work scenario, and so it is plausible that this model might relate to organizational theory, but no element of the model, literature review or discussion relates to sociological concepts. For publication in a sociology journal the author may want to select a motivating example that pertains to sociology.

**Response**

Thank you for the suggestion. You are correct in that the paper and many of the examples are meant to connect to organizational theory. Ultimately, the paper is about individuals selecting goals so many of my examples focus on that topic. The paper now includes an example in the discussion section that hopefully ties more directly with sociology: navigating work vs family relationships and goals. That said, you may even find that example limited. If you have suggestions about which concepts from sociology would make for better examples I would be happy to hear about them and do my best to incorporate.