Dear Dr. Payne,

Firstly, many sincere thanks for your recent review of our paper “The AMPeror’s New Clothes: Performance in the Affect Misattribution Procedure is Mainly Driven by Awareness of Influence of the Primes” for JPSP. We were extremely grateful for your extensive, thoughtful, and comprehensive comments.

Since receiving your review, we have been trying to conceive of a paradigm that can be used to more effectively investigate the potential moderating role (if any) which awareness of prime influence has on AMP effects. One idea we have had involves taking further inspiration from the paradigm of Experiment 3 from Payne et al. (2013). Specifically, we had intended to use our IA-AMP paradigm, but to ask participants about whether their evaluation of the target will be influenced by the prime *before* any response is given (i.e., thus avoiding the confounding issue of retrospective confabulation). From our perspective, this approach overcomes the previous issues of retrospective self-report which you pointed out in our work, while simultaneously providing more information than the original 2013 paradigm (i.e., it allows for us to compare within-subject AMP effects based on trials which are prospectively described as influenced vs. uninfluenced).

Before running with this paradigm, we were hoping to get your opinion on its suitability to addressing questions relating to influence awareness in the AMP. Do you think that such a method successfully overcomes the issue of using post-hoc self-report measures? And more generally, do you think that this revised method could be useful to address whether influence awareness plays a role in effects which are seen in the AMP?

If you have the opportunity to provide us with any feedback on this revised version of our paradigm, we would greatly appreciate it. We would also like to thank you again for taking the time to review our manuscript and for providing critical and highly useful feedback.

Best regards

Jamie Cummins

Ian Hussey

Sean Hughes