|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| First, the description of the website is fairly confusing.  From the main homepage, it is unclear whether LAB refers to the entire website, or just the NORMS subheading. After re-reading the paper and re-visiting the website, I now see that LAB is located within the specific NORMS subheading.  It therefore becomes confusing how this particular subheading relates to the other subheadings (about, search, words, etc…) and how LAB relates to the items in the words, search, and about pages. | Make the home page of wordnorms a “what are you interested in”  Move the purpose statement to the words page |
| My understanding is that the rest of the webpage supports the Buchanan et al. (2013) feature overlap project, which is one of the many databases cited in LAB.  I personally think it makes more sense to highlight the LAB website as the main site with a tab or link to the feature database and all its own subheadings.  I think that would really help users distinguish between (and navigate between) the two projects. |  |
| Once the reader understands how to get to the LAB site, I think the method section would make much more sense.  However, even this section of the paper was pretty confusing for me and I really didn’t understand all the functions until I read the how-to guide. I would therefore recommend structuring the method section more like the user’s guide with pictures and descriptions of each function. |  |
| Second, I didn’t really understand the importance of the article’s stated second purpose.  The publication frequencies, database size by year, and tags sections didn’t really fit with the rest of the paper.  I would have preferred a more thorough description of LAB and its uses. The trend analysis would have been better served in the intro to reinforce the authors’ point about the need to navigate through the huge growth in psycholinguistic databases. | Are we gonna take this out to resubmit? |
| The authors should probably refer to the Gibson website in their introduction and explain how their site improves upon the former in functionality for searching psycholinguistic databases. |  |
| The first website [[http://www.wordnorms.com](http://www.wordnorms.com/)] did not work and did not redirect me to the second and the link to the McRae norms was not working. |  |
| On page 10, line 4. Maybe replace “non-word selections” with “non-linguistic” selections to avoid confusion with nonwords used in lexical decision. | Changed |
| Page 13, last word.  “Examine trend” | Changed to trends |
| Regarding the selection of norms studies, the authors state that their main interest lies in linguistic database norms, but other types of stimuli such as drawings or symbols are also included. This means for example, that the Snodgrass and Vanderwart (1980) norms and its many replications are also part of the LAB database. Given that the initial focus were the linguistic norms, pictorial stimuli tends to be somewhat underrepresented. This might be due to the keywords that were used (corpus, linguistic database, linguistic norms etc, see p7). | Pretty sure we just searched database so change this a little bit |
| For example, this excludes photographic stimuli that are being developed as alternatives to the Snodgrass norms, but which still include the same psycholinguistic variables as the line drawings (see for instance Moreno-Martinez & Montoro, 2012). Besides specific types of studies, it should also be noted that a sizeable collection of norms that are available in non-English journals and books. For these norms, access remains difficult, but I don't see a very easy solution for this problem. | Tons of work from Snodgrass, check the wording on this  Checked those articles. Waiting for you to delete any non-norm ones so I can go in and find any that are missing to fix this. |
| First, as mentioned above, I would suggest to expand the initial search queries to cover pictorial and image norms for scenes or objects as well; especially if other psycholinguistic norms are included such as naming, familiarity, concreteness and other ratings. | Goes with above |
| Second, the paper and website allow the inspection of trends, but the discussion of these trends was quite limited. Are there important lessons or take-home messages that can be inferred from these trends other than the advent of big-data through online acquisition methods? **For instance, is there any evidence that certain variables rise while others drop (e.g. word frequency, word familiarity or perhaps contextual diversity)** because a particular variable is favoured on empirical or theoretical grounds? To what degree do they reflect merely going in and out of fashion (e.g. the shift from semantic memory in the seventies to concepts and categories in the eighties, and now perhaps back to semantic memory)? |  |
| - P 4, I am not sure if all lexicon projects contain both lexical decision and naming response times in all these languages. For instance in the case of Dutch no naming data is collected. | Ok check the papers for these  Fix dutch one to not have that tag |
| - P 8, Can you indicate to what degree the current index expands the number of studies that were present in Proctor and Vu? | P&V have 142, we have 561 as of the last pub date. Not sure how to work this into pg 8 though…. |
| - Table 1, provide explanation in caption of the table (N is a bit confusing here). | Add that  In the table, as a note on the table, or in the paragraph talking about the table? I suggest not the first, unless we change N to frequency or something. |
| - P 11, the explanation about the correlations reported in Table 3 seems to be missing since it is only introduced on P 14. | Explain these better?  Added in a bit in the first sentence, but at the end of pg 14/beginning of 15 we have a paragraph describing them so… |
| - Figure 2, it might be useful to include a sensible baseline measurement. Could it be that there are now more publications than before? | BRM publication numbers across year  MONKEY |
| - P 13, are the really large stimuli numbers referring to tokens rather than stimuli types? If so, reporting the number of types should allow a more natural comparison with the smaller studies. | Yes eek |
| - Consider adding a column that indicate whether norms are open and freely available. | Oohhhh |
| - I would suggest making a distinction between the Words search (which now only refers to  the English norms) and the rest of the website (which includes norms from all kinds of studies). This was a bit confusing now. | Yes see above |
| - Consider structuring the variables. For example, you might use a taxonomy for grouping words and images, and additionally thematically group variables (e.g. imageability, concreteness and modal-specific norms). Also include a section or column for software (e.g. pseudoword generators). | Separate out database name and column for software  Hierarchy of stimuli  Pretty maps for tags? |
| - The word search gave an error, so couldn't be tested. PHP Notice: Undefined variable: var in D:\inetpub\[wordnorms.missouristate.edu](http://wordnorms.missouristate.edu/)\search-results.php on line 111 PHP Notice: Undefined variable: var in D:\inetpub\[wordnorms.missouristate.edu](http://wordnorms.missouristate.edu/)\search-results.php on line 111 |  |
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