

I would like to thank the authors for the effort dedicated to the manuscript. I believe the quality improved considerably in this new version. Still, I have minor comments that need to be addressed.

Thanks for clarifying that you used sum contrast for the factors included in the model. Please, add this information in the manuscript in the Methods section when describing the model.

Thanks for clarifying that NEC correspond to transparency congruency. However, I still think it is easier for the reader to have a more transparent name, as you did with `Target_gender`. This is very intuitive. I strongly suggest to change the codes for full names in the text and tables so the reader can easily understand the meaning (I think this can be easily done without re-running the analysis).

Thanks for clarifying that the list had no effect. Still, the reader should have this information available. I believe including the list as a fixed effect, as I previously suggested, will improve the predictions of the model (even if this is not significant, part of the variance will be controlled). Otherwise, indicate whatever analysis you did you double check the list effect at least in a footnote or supplementary material.

Post-hoc: Here I am not sure I understand fully what you mean. As I understand your answer, you did not perform post-hoc comparison by dividing the analysis into two different models. What I understood is that you used the “lsmean” function to explore the pairwise comparison of each of the levels. If this is what you exactly did, please report this as such in the manuscript.

A look at the RTs: Thanks for the clarification. Still, I believe the expression “a look at the RTs reveals” is very confusing. Maybe you could describe this in a different way: “a visual inspection of the raw values of RT seemed to indicate that”

Xadrez: Thanks for the clarification. I still encounter some problems understanding the last part of the sentence: “conversely, for targets and distractors of the same transparency category, “tapete” and “xadrez” [chess] $p = .90$ “ — Do you mean that the opposite pattern was found for targets and distractors of the same transparency category? If so, I would describe this directly: “conversely, when the target and the distractor had the same transparency category, the effect disappeared/was not significant”