We wish to thank the reviewers for their thorough and insightful comments.

Review1:

- We are happy to revise based on suggestions raised by the reviewer to improve the abstract (key findings) and citation numbering.
- We agree one of the most substantial contributions is in the development of the coding scheme, and it should be explained in more detail. We are happy to include examples in the text with reference to online appendices.
- We agree that the question of spontaneous production, in comparison to Manalo & Uesaka (2014, 2012) would improve the discussion. We suspect that two key sources of difference are: (1) the represented data were activities with high personal involvement, multiple variables, and multiple levels of granularity to be represented, and (2) the instigating scenario was imaginative, priming creativity.

Review2:

- We agree that from this work one cannot conclude that students conceptualize time as linear rather than cyclical, and this is a primary focus for future work. In particular, by providing tools to visualize time-use at multiple scales (days, weeks, months), we seek to draw attention to patterns (sequence) in time-use rather than durations, in turn evaluating how this impacts behavior.
- We agree, context is improved with inclusion of the coding scheme, instructions and more diagrams (see above).
- Interestingly, the study was done with senior students interested in graduate study. We found (from surveys) that students had remarkably poor time management skills, and few utilized any form of system for time planning. Future work will be conducted in France and USA to examine differences in planning behavior.
- Following the constant comparison method, the coders discussed coding after every 5 diagrams.
- Great catch on Figure 1; we will include a different student diagram (no arrows) as an exemplar of the category.

Review3:

- See above regarding including coding, diagrams and task instructions in appendices.