|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comment | What to change | Changed? |
| States that we just did analyses they already did:  In all 5 of J&C’s corpora, RSA predicted valence when word length and letter frequency were controlled.  But did we do this the first run? Did we do it because he suggested that would be right? (finger switching added in ) | Take out 2 databases they analyzed, take out Dodds cause they already did that too |  |
| The authors are not reporting the effect of Finger Repetition, a highly relevant variable, which should have been a key predictor of word valence, and which they included in their statistical model in the original submission. | In the R folder it shows we ran hand switching and finger switches nested. |  |
| Result issues:  “The effects of greatest interest show no reliable effects.” | Go back to this after doing the top two and see if any of them are still an issue. |  |
| It doesn’t make sense to combine the corpora. | Don’t analyze the combo corpora |  |
| In experiment 2 we need a detailed description of how we constructed the corpus, how we avoided bias, etc. | In experiment 2 we need a detailed description of how we constructed the corpus, how we avoided bias, etc. |  |
| He wants more words in exp 2 to be convinced | So we should run the new experiment where we did more words (5 letter, etc.) and show him that it still does the same thing. |  |
| He talks about how the results change because the analysis changed | Just need to write back and explain his review comments helped us see the error of our ways and we fixed it and look it’s better now so let us publish this jazz |  |
| He doesn’t like we used length and letter frequency as predictors in exp 2 since we used it as a control in exp 1 | Don’t do this I guess? |  |
| Says the Verb corpus is too small | Should we just make a note? |  |
| Keyboard Asymmetry account | We should look at what this is and if it can support our hyps. |  |
| RSA or RHA? | Use RSA |  |
| He says stuff | We should be nice |  |