Dear Dr. Neath,

I thank you and the Reviewers for your comments on my manuscript ``Temporal Contiguity in Incidentally Encoded Memories'' (JML-17-336). The manuscript presented evidence that the Temporal Contiguity Effect can be dramatically reduced, but not always eliminated, under incidental encoding conditions. I argued that these findings challenge all existing models of the effect, but especially those that attribute temporal contiguity to deliberate encoding strategies. In response to the issues raised by yourself and the Reviewers, I have extensively revised the manuscript. These revisions, which are detailed in the “Response to Reviews” file include the addition of a new experiment as well as a meta-analysis of the effect size across the 8 incidental encoding conditions reported in the manuscript.

I want to stress my gratitude to yourself and the Reviewers for your very helpful feedback. Given that this feedback prompted theoretically substantive changes to the manuscript, I hope it is appropriate that I have included a thank you to yourself, Dr. Nairne, and Reviewer 1 in the acknowledgments. I hope you agree that the resulting changes have strengthened the manuscript considerably.

Finally, one of the reviewer’s comments made me wonder if they did not have access to the supplemental materials—I know some submission systems only send the main text. I bring this up because I have added analyses of subject’s second list to the supplemental materials. I don’t think these are of sufficient interest to most readers to warrant including them in the main text, but I do want to make sure the reviewers have access.

Sincerely,
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M. Karl Healey

khealey@msu.edu

Assistant Professor of Psychology

Michigan State University