Review 3:

7. The association task involved learning to a criterion, but there's no report of how long people took or what kind of individual variability was found. This is perhaps not a critical problem, but I would find the results much more compelling if there was more information about individual variability, as the error bar plots on their own are not that informative.

The association task in part 1 took about average 3.16 minutes to get to the criteria, and the variability across participants were 0.69~13.25 minutes. We also conducted ANOVA in the number of corrected trials and RTs in the three conditions (self, friend, or stranger) in part 1 in the two experiments respectively. In Experiment 1, the results on the number of corrected trials showed a significant effect of association, F(2, 38) = 1.38, p = .262, η2 = .07, there is no difference among the three associations.

In Experiment 2, the results on the number of corrected trials showed a significant effect of association, F = , p =; there was a significant effect of association in RTs, F =, p < .01??, there were less number of correct trials for the self than for the friend (t = , p < ), but there was no difference between self and stranger (t = , p < ) and between the friend and stranger associations. The analysis in RTs revealed was a significant effect of association in RTs, F =, p < .01??, there were less number of correct trials for the self than for the friend (t = , p < ) and stranger (t = , p < ) associations, but there is no difference between the friend and stranger associations..

Reviewer 2

Results for the analysis comparing the control vs. switch experiment were rather unclear. After finding a task x association interaction, post-hocs are reported for the control task. However, more important in my opinion would be t-tests between self trials in the control task and self-trials in the switch task, as the authors would predict that there would be significantly fewer errors in the control task?

Haixu, I cannot find control data. Can you please send it to me?

Please add this test after significant interaction, that is, the difference in self-trials between part2 and control expt.

关于review3

1. 实验1应该是20人的结果，基本信息统计时忘了去掉已删除的6号被试，在participants中写的21，与结果报告不一致，需更正；
2. 实验2，我的数据共25人，但文章结果报告中是20人，不确定哪些被试的结果未加入统计，正确试次个数见《Exp2\_s to f\_sequ\_20141226》中的“sequ\_s->f\_Correct CoungtNum.”工作簿
3. 每个实验Part1的RT在文章中已有报告

关于Reviewer 2

1. 文中报告control中的被试共22人，年龄19-32之间，我的实验数据中baseline是31人，年龄是19-29，不知是不是我的这批数据，或者是删除了哪些人的结果