Dear Dr. Cardwell:

We are extremely grateful to you and the reviewers for your re-consideration of our manuscript, “Attentional priorities drive effects of time pressure on altruistic choice”. We greatly appreciate Reviewer 2 and 3’s support and encouragement and Reviewer 1’s comments. Based on this feedback, we have conducted additional complementary analyses and another on-line study to provide additional empirical support for our findings. Although you can find our detailed responses attached separately, here we summarize the major changes we have made.

Specifically, reviewer 1 had residual concerns that regression towards the mean may possibly be driving changes in generosity from high to low time pressure. To address this, we conducted 3 separate analyses to illustrate the robustness of our findings based on the preconditions for regression towards the mean. Importantly, we found little evidence of measurement variability in generosity in analyses of reliability and consistent replication of the effect within and across experiments, even when we excluded participants that were most likely to exhibit regression towards the mean. We now report these analyses in further detail in a new supplementary note (see Note 1 in the revised supplements for details). To summarize, we found that **regression towards the mean is unlikely to account for the pattern of effects we observed.** Rather, the additional analyses further supported our initial interpretation that individual differences in early attention drove these changes.

Reviewer 1 was also concerned about the possibility that attention’s effect might be driven by incomplete information search rather than real-time amplification. However, it is in fact *precisely* this point that we are trying to make: that time pressure can both amplify attentional biases to acquire certain pieces of information search, and also truncate the search process before all information has been fully comprehended. Our analyses suggest that this does appear to be an important factor in the results we report in both Studies 1 and 2 (for more details, see our response to Reviewer 1 below). Nevertheless, we also suspected that attentional amplification, as opposed to mere ignorance, also plays a role under the right circumstances. We thus conducted a second on-line study to probe the influence of attention’s real-time amplification of value evidence. In this study we ensured participants were presented all relevant information but manipulated the exposure duration of the 2nd piece of information. **Importantly, we not only show a strong causal influence of early attention on choices, replicating Studies 1 & 2, but also that increased information sampling reduced this influence.** These findings strongly support our original interpretation that time pressure both truncate information search processes and amplify attentional biases during evidence accumulation. However, while we share the reviewer’s interest in this important empirical question about the relative contributions of distinct mechanisms, we believe that it requires its own extensive investigation beyond the scope of our paper. We have thus for the time being opted not to include this new study in the current paper, though we of course are happy to do so if you or Reviewer 1 believe it would significantly strengthen the manuscript.

We have also taken care to address each of the other concerns raised by Reviewer 1 and revised the manuscript appropriately as described in our point-by-point response.

Taken together, we believe these revisions have addressed the remaining concerns of Review 1, and helped to emphasize even further the importance and interest of our conclusions to the broad readership of *Nature Communications*. Point-by-point responses to the reviewer comments have been separately submitted. Thank you again for your consideration of our revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Yi Yang Teoh, Ziqing Yao, William Cunningham, & Cendri Hutcherson