Comments by the editor:

**To help you address the reviewers' comments, the revised manuscript may be up to 4000 words and may include up to 120 references and 6 elements.**

1. **First, they noted that some of the problems you identify and the solutions you offer are rather general and would apply to many research topics. To bring more specificity to the piece, please include a deeper discussion of the impacts of voice naturalness on listener perception and behavior. This will help increase the stakes of the piece. Additionally, please develop the future directions section to include examples specifically relevant to naturalness and understanding its impacts.**

Response: ToDo

* Make recommendations section more specific
* Impact of voice naturalness on listener perception and behavior: impact for pathological voices, maybe focus more on synthetic voices.
* Interplay with emotion
* Context-specificity?
* > wo im Manuscript einfügen?

1. **Second, the reviewers have indicated various points where you should provide more evidence that representations of voice naturalness differ from representations of other voice characteristics. If this evidence is not always available, this should be made clear and potentially highlighted as a future direction**.

Response: ToDo

* I would not argue that it does. Its just something that we have not studied sufficiently yet
* Ich glaube wir müssen nochmal diskutieren, was genau mit dem Punkt gemeint ist

1. **Third, Reviewer 1 has some questions about how the systematic search for articles was conducted and wonders whether different search terms might yield different results. Please note that TiCS articles cannot report the results of systematic reviews, nor can key points made in the piece rely on an unpublished systematic review. Given this, it will be important to find alternative ways to support the key premises of the piece, such as the lack of consistent definitions and the lack of exchange between different research domains. For example, to show the lack of consistent definitions, you could present representative examples of the definition-based, human-likeness-based, and combination definitions in a Table. I am open to including Figure 1C (with corresponding documentation included as a supplement), but you should provide additional evidence supporting the claim that there is a lack of exchange between the different research domains.**

Response: ToDo

* Tabelle wäre kein Problem
* Zusätzliche Evidenz für lack of exchange: Zwei aktuelle Reviews in zwei Feldern, aber beide haben keinerlei Cross-Referenz
* Nor that any of the voice models and the papers on first impression formation study naturalness

1. **This is a Review (as opposed to an Opinion), so please avoid using highly opinionated language such as “we argue”. “We discuss/suggest/show/etc.” would be fine.**

Response: The rather opinionated language was originally intended, but in agreement with the guidelines for reviews, we have now applied the suggested in changes throughout the manuscript (e.g. the abstract “argue” -> “suggest”, page 4 “we argue” -> “our impression is”, page 6 “argue” -> “we therefore conclude”)

1. **Please do not number the different sections and subsections.**

Response: We removed the numbering of the sections (please note for the sake of readability, we did not mark this adjustment in the version with tracked changes).

1. **Many of the bolded terms do not appear in the Glossary. Please ensure that all bolded terms appear in the Glossary and that Glossary terms are in bold the first time they are used. Glossary terms should be listed in alphabetic order and should not include references. If a reference is needed, please include it when the Glossary term is first used.**

Response: Changed as suggested. (please note for the sake of readability, we did not mark this adjustment in the version with tracked changes).

1. **Please include DOIs for any preprints, e.g. [101].**

Response: We adjusted the citation template to display DOIs for all references, if available. (please note for the sake of readability, we did not mark this adjustment in the version with tracked changes).

Reviewer 1:

**This is a very interesting paper on a timely topic, written by a team of authors that are exceedingly well placed to offer their expert perspective. Given the rapid rise in the sophistication of voice synthesis and its applications it's important that the various literatures concerned with the impact of human and synthetic voices strive for greater synthesis in their approach. This much-needed call to action paper offers suggestions for how to facilitate greater cross-disciplinary harmony, with the ultimate aim that research across fields can yield clearer and more applicable insights into how voices of different kinds might affect human behaviours. Although the paper focuses on voices, there are implications for perception of human vs "human-like" stimuli and entities across modalities and contexts. I have a few suggestions about ways to add depth and focus, which I think could greatly enhance the paper's impact.**

Response: Thank you very much for this positive evaluation. We are particularly happy that you share our impression on the timeliness of the topic. We appreciate your constructive feedback, which we address in detail below.

1. **The authors make a number of well-made observations about some of the insufficiencies of the existing literature on naturalness, including inconsistent terminology, missing/inconsistent definitions of terms for raters, lack of audio examples in published reports. However, these criticisms could be levelled at many topics of research in voice (and face) perception. For example, studies of voice/face/person trait perception often invoke low-dimensional social trait spaces to explain patterns of trait ratings. These dimensions may be conceptually equivalent or similar, but are labelled variably depending on the authors (e.g. Fiske describes these as "warmth and competence" while McAleer et al. uses "valence and dominance"; sociolinguists may use yet different approaches e.g. Bayard et al., 2001). Therefore, I think the current paper needs to make the specific case for \*naturalness\*. One way to address this would be to include more detailed motivation on the impacts of varying naturalness on listener perceptions and behaviour. What are the implications of finding certain human or synthetic voices to be more or less natural-sounding? What is the published evidence that naturalness affects behaviours in different contexts, for example human-human communication vs. human-computer interaction? Can you use these examples to convince the reader of the importance/timeliness of studying naturalness, as a basis for some of the more specific methodological criticisms and suggestions?**

Response: ToDo

* Stefan: literature on impression formation and cross-references
* Todo: include papers in impact of naturalness on perception and behavior
* Maybe interplay with emotion?
* Add some more findings from papers
* Methodological criticism: make the point of ecological validity more prominent?

1. **Given the problems with terminology and cross-disciplinary awareness that are highlighted in the paper, it will be particularly important for the authors to make sure that they don't fall into the same trap of overlooking relevant research in other fields. The literature search yielded >300 papers, which is substantial, but based on only 2 search terms - if these are themselves informed by the authors' own preferred terminologies then the endeavour becomes circular. I wonder if it would be possible, for example, to use the ChatGPT analysis in a more task-driven way to generate more varied search terms for the literature search, rather than in the more illustrative way it is currently presented.**

Response: You raise an important issue here. We would like to address this by first clarifying our objectives and scope of the literature search. In this manuscript, we present several claims about current shortcomings in the literature (e.g. lacking interconnectivity, inconsistent conceptualization etc.) and we saw a strong need to substantiate these claims with a more objective approach. We intended Box 1 as a transparent roadmap allowing to reconstruct how we reached our conclusions. For this reason, we provided the reader with rather detailed information on how papers were searched and selected, in a manner that’s reminiscent of systematic literature reviews or meta-analyses. However, we never aimed or claimed this to be a fully and exhaustive literature integration. Note that in point 3 the editor also explicitly advised us not to base our key arguments on published or unpublished systematic reviews. To make it more transparent to readers that this is NOT a fully systematic literature search, we reworded the first sentence in Box 1 as follows: “*For a more systematic overview on scientific insights into naturalness in voices, we conducted an exemplary literature search on Web of Science*” (page 16)

Nonetheless, your very valid concern about potential biases introduced by the search terms itself needs to be addressed. Unfortunately, it is very likely that there is still insightful work on naturalness out there that we were not able to find. In fact, there are some references where we contacted the authors several times to get access to the material but without success. We further suspect that there exist many papers where naturalness is not the main focus, but rather a small side note, resulting them to slip through any search we could have conducted. Thus, the key question here is not if we missed out on papers concerning naturalness - we most likely did - but if we missed out on something of crucial relevance, i.e. something that would reveal a blind spot in our current view on the literature or that would call for a critical expansion of the conceptual framework we proposed. While this possibility can never be fully excluded, we consider it rather unlikely for several reasons: We went back to our search history again and found that only 38 of the 72 papers were identified directly from the Web of Science search. The rest was found in the reference lists of identified papers and were therefore not tied to the two search terms. This is corroborated by the keywords, showing that only ~20 of the papers included “naturalness” or “human-likeness”. In short, the literature we cover goes well beyond the two search terms. Since the literature we found was already very diverse and hard to integrate, adding more keywords may complicate the matter rather than complementing it. Terms like “voice quality”, “severity” or “clarity” for example could be dangerous because they are used to refer to several distinct concepts in the voice perception literature, potentially returning non-specific and chaotic search results.

1. **With the suggestions for future research: I would again like to see more targeted examples that are specifically relevant to naturalness and understanding its impacts. With the birdsong example it's not clear that environment-dependent changes in vocal behavior would be specifically related to naturalness rather than "typicality", or specifically related to voice naturalness rather than syntactic/structural deviations.**

Response: ToDo

* Point for discussion with Stefan and Sascha

1. **Some smaller points: Figures 1A and 1B: The large number of terms presented in these two word clouds might strengthen the argument that searching the literature for papers only on "naturalness" and "human-likeness" is not sufficient to capture all the relevant research (see my point above).**

Response: Please refer to our response to point 9. For a systematic review or a meta-analysis, you would be completely right, and a search would have needed to be much broader in an effort to catch all available literature on voice naturalness. As discussed above, this was not our primary goal since we did not aim for a systematic review. Nevertheless, it would be a pity if a relevant line of research were not represented, because we neglected important keywords. Therefore, we ran additional Web of Science searches on some keywords and checked, how many of our included papers would come up in the results (all done in October 2024): “realism AND voice” (5 papers), “anthropomorphism AND voice” (6), “artificial\* AND voice” (10), “normal\* AND voice” (3), “accept\* AND voice” (9), “clarity AND voice” (3), “ease\* AND voice” (3), and “quality AND voice” (19). Thus, although we may not have found all papers that concern naturalness, research from all these keywords is somewhat represented in our literature overview. The only exception is “authenticity AND voice”, which picked up 0 of our naturalness papers. This is probably because we made an explicit effort to keep the concepts of naturalness and authenticity separate.

1. **What was the specific purpose of generating the ChatGPT wordcloud, and was ChatGPT prompted specifically for synonyms of voice naturalness? Perhaps this approach would be more motivating as a way to generate e.g. the top 10 words as search terms for the literature search.**

Response: The purpose of the ChatGPT wordcloud was to complement the one created based on the literature, in order to compensate for potential “blind spots” in Figure 1A. Despite our best efforts to provide transparency and reproducibility, the terms from the literature were manually extracted by us, which makes them prone to biases. We conducted the ChatGPT analysis to complement this with a more objective approach. We were interested if this would return some crucial terms we had completely overlooked. And indeed, it revealed a strong association to authenticity, motivating us to include a clear conceptual demarcation to naturalness in the manuscript.

The specific prompts and ChatGPT’s original response are all available on the associated OSF repository (https://osf.io/asfqv/?view\_only=62f8d88705bb4363903983c8bd08a2cf). The promts were (1) “List synonyms for naturalness in pathological voices. Assign each synonym a frequency between 1 and 0, depending on how often it is used.”, (2) “Now do the same for synthetic and manipulated voices.”, (3) “Now do the same for healthy human voices.”, (4) “Now combine all three lists and omit any repetitions.” This gave us an overview on the association between naturalness and other terms in the non-scientific online literature. However, one needs to be aware that ChatGPT is also biased in several ways. This is why we presented both Figure 1A and 1B. Neither of them is flawless, but they complement each other. We agree that the resulting terms could be used as a starting point for a systematic literature search in the future. For the present paper, we considered its illustrative function sufficient.

1. **Use of idioms and journalistic style: There are a few instances that I would recommend re-wording for clarity and precision. For example: P3, lines 50-53: "For synthetic voices, one can hardly keep up with the rapid developments which make indefatigable efforts to resemble human vocal expression" - I would suggest toning this down, e.g. "For synthetic voices, recent years have seen rapid developments in the effort to create stimuli that resemble human vocal expression".**

Response: Valid point. Changed as suggested (page 3).

1. **P4, lines 2-5: "we are currently looking at a rag rug rather than a research field" - this idiom is not so familiar for English speakers.**

Response: Good point. We changed it into “patchwork” (page 4)

1. **P6, line 21: ""Does this voice sound unusual" - missing question mark.**

Response: Thank you. Changed as suggested (page 7).

1. **P8, line 24: "They found that impressions of uncanniness resulted from "deviation from familiar categories" rather "categorical ambiguity"." - should this be "rather than"?**

Response: Yes, thank you. Changed as suggested (page 8)

1. **P9, line 22: "very prevalent danger" - I would tone this down a bit, especially as some deepfaking may be intentional and agreed (e.g. an actor allowing their voice to be cloned to make a documentary).**

Response: We personally consider deepfakes mostly a danger (despite possible intentional and harmless applications), but we are happy to use a more balanced wording here and changed it into “very prevalent challenge”. (page 9)

1. **"Likewise, voice gender cues can be rated for gender authenticity, which is closely related to judgement of gender conformity [71,72]." - I would personally not get into discussions of "authenticity" when it comes to gender perception, because this is a complex and emotive issue that goes well beyond the aims of the current paper. I would only include this if you feel that this adds something to your specific argument at this point in the paper, beyond the other examples given.**

Response: We do see your point, but as you say, the matter is complex. You are right that gender perception and gender identity goes beyond the aims of the current paper, and is an emotive topic. But there is substantial and important research on both naturalness and authenticity perception that specifically targets questions of gender (e.g. see the work by Baird at al. 2018 on non-binary synthetic voices, https://doi.org/10.17743/jaes.2018.0023). Therefore, to provide readers with a broad overview of the field, this research deserves mentioning. Having said that, we completely see your call for caution, because superficial or premature statements may come across as offensive if they do not do the complexity of the topic justice. We therefore discussed our wording thoroughly and rephrased the sentence as follows:

“In principle, authenticity can be assessed with regard to manifold social signals, including age, gender, or even personality [71,72].” (page 9)

1. **Other word choices could be changed for better clarity: "processual" could be "processing" or "process-related" and "restitutes" could be "restores".**

Response: Changed as suggested. (pages 10 and 11)

Reviewer 2:

**It was a pleasure to read this piece. The writing is excellent, and the review offers a great summary of the existing evidence on voice naturalness, highlighting the current issues in this field and proposing ways to advance it. This review is much needed. It will bring conceptual clarity to research on this topic, making it more theory-driven and unifying different subfields coherently. Additionally, it provides numerous suggestions for improving future research. I find myself in the rare position of not having many suggestions to offer. There is just one topic that it would be interesting to speculate about:**

Response: We are very grateful for this positive evaluation, and we are particularly happy that you share our opinion about the importance of the topic.

1. **In terms of processing time-course and underlying brain mechanisms, how are representations of naturalness different from representations of other voice characteristics (e.g., age, gender, trustworthiness)?**

Response: ToDo Sascha

* Sascha, wäre das evtl ein Punkt, den du übernehmen könnest?
* Evtl discussion of its interplay with voice naturalness
* Evtl. Annetts Paper in “voiceness” (todo: nochmal raussuchen)

1. **Minor point: the second sentence ('From a biological perspective, naturalness… evolutionary meaning.') is somewhat vague. I suggest the authors revise it for specificity and clarity.**

Response: We refined it as follows: “*From a biological perspective, naturalness may relate to an adaptive norm, with extreme deviations supposedly being rather “unnatural” instances. Evaluations of naturalness influence food choice, environmental preferences, and social trust and therefore carry evolutionary meaning [1–3].*” (page 3)

Reviewer 3:

**The present manuscript presents an overview of the current developments in research on voice naturalness. Here the authors outline some of the problems with the current work and suggest a distinction between two types of naturalness (deviation-based and human-likeness-based naturalness) in order to further enhance and unite research in this area while also referring back to prominent voice perception models. I agree with the authors that this topic is very current and timely given the fast-paced improvements in AI technology making it more and more difficult to tell apart human and computer-generated material be it face images or voices. I do, however, question the two distinct types of naturalness proposed by the authors in the way they have been defined and whether this distinction is easily resolved by contextual cues. Please find my detailed comments below.**

Response: Thank you for your overall evaluation and for proposing very helpful and valid suggestions. Below, we will address each of your points in detail.

1. **Asking participants to judge whether a particular voice is perceived as a plausible outcome of the human speech production system implies that some voices will not be produced by human speakers. It is therefore not clear how this is an example of deviation-based naturalness. The authors themselves acknowledge that human-likeness-based naturalness could be viewed as a type of deviation-based naturalness (with human voice as a reference point). They argue that the only difference between these two types of naturalness is the additional assumption of the existence of non-human voices. However, the earlier formulation seems to suggest the existence of non-human voices, so it is not clear why it is deemed as a more appropriate example of deviation- rather than human-likeness-based naturalness.**

Response: ToDo

* Valid point, maybe the given example for an instruction is not ideal, because it bridges both conceptualization
* Still important: for the conceptual definition its not decisive, whether voices are indeed human or not, but how they are perceived

1. **What is more, based on the authors' definitions, the distinction between the two types of naturalness could easily be resolved when everyday context is considered. For example, speaking with someone in person could address deviation-based naturalness only, whereas any online interaction leaves open the opportunity for voices to be non-human and therefore engages human-likeness-based naturalness. Perhaps this distinction is meant to be more helpful for experimental design rather than our everyday experiences of evaluating voice naturalness.**

Response: ToDo

* Yes and no. see above point. Its about the perception, not about whether the voice is “really” human or not.
* But the context is still a valid point – in human-to-human interactions, human-likeness definitions don’t make sense
* And yes, absolutely – it is to some degree motivated to help very practically with experimental design and comparability
* Diese distinction kann mit zunehmender technologisierung kleiner werden (Beispiel: personalized voices synthesis)

1. **At the beginning of their review, the authors refer to the first impressions literature but there is no empirical evidence provided that shows human listeners spontaneously form impressions of naturalness or how naturalness could affect the impressions we form. There are a couple of recent papers where listeners were asked to freely describe their first impressions from voices (Lavan, 2023 with a Western sample and Jiang et al., 2023 with a Chinese sample). Neither of these papers seems to mention evaluations of naturalness. Some additional references to previous first impressions work that evaluates naturalness are needed to support this point.**

Response: ToDo

* Todo: include the mentioned papers, also the recent Lavan EEG papers
* Discuss the qualitative descriptions of Kühne maybe

1. **While generally helpful, the proposed practical recommendations for voice naturalness research could be applied to any other field and do not specifically target research in voice naturalness. Providing sufficient methodological details would improve work in any area.**

Response: Indeed, you are right that many of our recommendations sound very general and may seem rather obvious. Still, they are not met by so many publications. There may be many reasons for that, one being that what seems obvious in one field may not be in another one. Thus, a rather simple and general “checklist” could still prove as very beneficial. Nevertheless, we reformulated some of our recommendations listed in Box 2 to make them more specific and we added some examples targeting naturalness research.

1. **In their discussion of the key problems in voice naturalness research, the authors mention the use of different rating scales to assess naturalness. Is there any evidence showing that using these scales leads to significantly different patterns of results? A recent paper by Kramer et al. (2024) compares the use of different types of rating scales for the evaluation of face attractiveness and they find very little evidence that scale use makes a considerable difference to the overall results reported.**

Response: ToDo

* Denominations of endpoints will definitely make a difference (give examples again, e.g. “robotic” vs “natural” etc.)
* ToDo: look if any paper used different rating scales
* Stefan: you had another paper on the impact of rating scales, right? Something about the impact of midpoints…

1. **The authors propose that human-based naturalness could be independent from distinctiveness - is there any empirical evidence to support this point?**

Response: ToDo

* To the best of our knowledge, no (check again)
* But we also didn’t claim that it was independent.
* This is rather an empirical question for the future

1. **It is argued within the text that voice naturalness and authenticity are processed in different stages with naturalness based on voice properties or features whereas authenticity based on speech or social/affective analysis. Is it not possible to evaluate naturalness of speech content - e.g., how likely is it that this speech content is produced by a human speaker? Relatedly, this implies that naturalness is assessed faster than authenticity - is there any evidence to suggest this in the literature?**

Response: ToDo

* ToDo: Check evidence on EEG evidence for authenticity
* Compare to the Duville-Papers
* But mostly: this is a testable hypothesis for the future. Maybe this can be made clearer