Dear Royal Society Open Science Editorial Office,

Thank you for the decision notification. We apologize for the late submission of these changes. We failed to noticed there was a tight deadline and hope we have not caused inconvenience by our delay.

Our responses to requests for changes are in italics below. All requested changes have been made. In addition, we also added that the screen resolution was different for a subset of the data collected in Essex (the stimulus dimensions in visual angle were matched).

----------------

Associate Editor Comments to Author (Professor Chris Chambers):

One of the original Stage 1 reviewers kindly returned to evaluate the completed Stage 2 manuscript, and I have decided that we can proceed on the basis of this review and my own reading of the manuscript. As you will see, the reviewer is very positive about the submission. I agree that this is a very solid Stage 2 report and the review criteria are basically met. There are some minor points to clarify in the review, after which full acceptance will be forthcoming without requiring further in-depth evaluation.

*We appreciate the positive evaluation of our Stage 2 report.*

Reviewer: 1

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)

The authors replicated pre-crastination behavior and variability in visual search efficiency. However, it would be helpful to report the standard deviation of the search strategy score in section 3(a) Visual Search so that it can be explicitly compared to the criterion of 0.1 from (e) Outcome-neutral conditions.

*Thank you for noticing this. We have added the standard deviation to section 3a (it is 1.92).*

Other comments

- 3. Results

o I wasn’t able to find the supplementary materials for further details on the 90 participants excluded from performance on the visual search task. Should this be available on Royal Society Open Source or OSF?

*We have added the details to OSF data.*

o Spelling mistake, “borkem leg”

*Fixed*

o Missing statistic, “XXX participants had blank or otherwise unusable data”

*Fixed (it was 20).*

- Figure 9

o The caption and text refer to (left) pre-crastination and (right) visual search strategies. However, Figure 9 has a left, center, and right. Should it be (center) pre-crastiation and (right) visual search? Related, what is (left) beads?

*Apologies, we inadvertently placed an earlier version of the figure that included other measures we did not pre-register for this report. It has been revised to only have two panels and the figure caption left as it currently is. Note: these other measures where conducted at the end of all the registered measures to ensure that they would not interfere with our registered plans.*

- 4. General Discussion

o Missing space, “a much larger sampledid not support that conclusion.”

*Fixed*