We thank the editors for the opportunity to publish our manuscript in SPPQ. We have made several revisions in response to the final round of feedback provided by the reviewers. These revisions are documented in this memo. We generally agree with the criticisms offered, and think that our manuscript has improved substantially as a result of incorporating this feedback.

Reviewer: 1

R1.1 *Is the table on p 13 just a table format of the list of things described on p 12? The authors say the list is taken from the literature, but the table isn't linked to citations.*

Addressed: We have added citations to this table.

R1.2 *I think the manuscript still suggests more evidence of spillover than is actually produced in the empirical tests. The abstract (and p 26) refer to "moderate" evidence of spillover. The conclusion says there is "[not] universal evidence for interference effects" (p 30), calls the evidence "mixed", and argues the tests provide "preliminary evidence that some state legislative field experiments are characterized by interference". I think these are all a big stretch. Both sets of replication tests yield one significant effect at the 0.10 level, with no correction for multiple hypothesis testing. While it's not zero evidence of spillover – it seems very weak to me, and I feel like trying to sell these results as "mixed" is not really accurate. The empirical tests can still provide something useful – as demonstrating the application – even if they do not support that spillover occurred.*

Addressed: We revised the language in reference to our findings to be less suggestive regarding the evidence for spillover effects. In the abstract we changed the word "moderate" to "mixed". In the conclusion we changed the word "universal" to "consistent". Also in the conclusion, we deleted the sentence fragment that begins with "preliminary evidence…" since it was not necessary to convey the main point of the sentence.

R1.3 *The authors mention the appendix includes R-script. Is this a new script others can apply, or just a standard replication file? If it's a tool, emphasize that. But I'm guessing it's not since that isn't described as a contribution*

Addressed: We have written the replication code such that the analysis steps use generic functions that we have written—functions that could be used with other applications. However, the specifics of the randomization designs in the experiments and the models of effects will likely be different in other applications, so we stop short of indicating that our replication materials provide an out-of-the-

box software solution for future applications.

R2.1 *In discussing exposure and uptake (~pg. 15), the authors could note/footnote Burt's (e.g., 1987) classic work on cohesion vs. structural equivalence. It would be good to further ground the discussion in classic network theory on models of diffusion.*

Addressed: We added a footnote in which we briefly discuss Burt's conceptual framework for understanding social contagion processes.

R2.2 *In providing advice on network selection (section 3.1), the authors note that scholars should use "a combination of theory and exploration" (pg. 13), and this seems like reasonable advice. I do think the authors might want to note that scholars should be careful in combining networks. If spillover occurs in a specific network, then combining additional networks can just add measurement error, producing biased estimates (see Larson and Rodriguez' working paper for a nice discussion of this).*

Addressed: We have added a cautionary note regarding the combination of multiple networks into a single composite measure.