**Editor**  
  
**Dear Miss Trendl,  
  
Thank you very much for submitting your manuscript "A zero attraction effect in naturalistic choice" for review and consideration for publication in Decision. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to review the manuscript.**

**I have received reviews from the three referees who reviewed the original submission.  One of them recommended publication of the current version and the other two consider this version an improvement, but have several additional points that they would like you to address.  They both think that a revised version should be published. Thus, I am happy to invite you to re-submit a revised version that addresses their concerns and requests. For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below.**

**Reviewer 1 insists on a new set of analyses ignoring the second choice.  I recognize that you have pre-registered the project and the analyses you planned, and that reporting these additional analyses may appear to deviate from the plan, but I would urge to report these analyses in the text or an appendix (your choice, based on the results and their interpretation), and feel free to indicate that they were requested as part of the editorial review process, if you wish.**

**Reviewer 2 has a long list of suggestions that could improve the presentation of your work and clarify some of the results. I am sure you will find most, possibly all, useful and relatively easy to implement.  The one point that may require some serious thought on your part is the reviewer’s view that you ”gave unwarranted deference” to the 5 criteria identified by Huber at al. (2014) which, in the reviewer’s opinion, are poorly justified. I am not sufficiently knowledgeable about this literature to have a clear opinion on this matter that, apparently, they are somewhat controversial.  I think you need to address this point in the text by indicating to what degree you consider them to be critical, or necessary for your work.**

**I hope that you can address these points and I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.**

**If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript.**

Dear Professor Budescu,  
  
Thank you for your comments. We have updated the manuscript with an analysis including the controls requested by Reviewer 1 using only the subset of first choices (Appendix Table A1).

We also implemented most of the suggestions of Reviewer 2, and we feel that the manuscript has been greatly improved as a result of these changes.

With respect to the justification of the five criteria, there is clearly a strong disagreement in the literature regarding their importance. While Reviewer 2 does not agree with them, the studies of Huber et al. (2014), and Simonson (2014) outlining these criteria (both written as a response to the Frederick et al study) have received 145 citations combined, which suggests that other researchers give credit to them. The focus of our study is not to discuss the relevance or appropriateness of each separate criterion (doing so would not improve, but dilute the paper in our view), but to inform the debate with a carefully designed test of the attraction effect with naturalistic choice options. The contribution of our study is that it shows that the effect is not present in choices involving naturalistic options even when the choice task has been specifically designed to elicit the attraction effect (as per the suggestions of Huber et al and Simonson). We have updated the introduction to make this view clearer.

*“In this article, we describe a rigorous test of the attraction effect with complex, naturalistic choice options, using a carefully developed experimental methodology that addresses all of the critical conditions discussed by Huber et al. (2014). If the attraction effect does not arise in a choice task that was specifically designed to elicit this decision bias (by satisfying the conditions set out by Huber et al.), then taken together with earlier results from Frederick et al. (2014) and Yang and Lynn (2014), this will provide strong evidence that the attraction effect is limited to choice tasks where options are (at least partly) represented with numerical attributes. However, if we find evidence for the attraction effect, then a closer examination of the five criteria is required to determine their relative importance. In line with the results reported by Frederick et al. (2014) and Yang and Lynn (2014), we find no evidence for the attraction effect.”*

Best,

Anna Trendl, Neil Stewart, Tim Mullett