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Liqi Zhu,
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Beijing, China

Resubmission: MS number IJP-REA-17-360

Dear Prof. Zhu,

I am pleased to send you my revised manuscript: “Effects of attention during encoding on sex differences in object location memory.” I am grateful to the reviewers and happy to learn that they acknowledged the potential contribution of my manuscript.

I followed all the reviewers’ recommendations and made the following changes to the manuscript (colored in blue). It is important to note that due to word limit, the MS was shortened and several references were removed.

First reviewer:

* In the introduction, I explain in what way the present work adds to the current knowledge (p. ).
* I have clarified the differences between the present MS and Barel (2016) (p. ).
* I added the publication year of Barel's paper in the References (p. ) as well as in several places in the MS (p. ).
* As the reviewer suggested, I elaborated on the results of divided vs. selective attention tasks in previous studies (p. ) and on findings regarding attention and memory (p. ).
* I added two figures showing the stimulus array before and after the encoding phase (p. ).
* The reviewer pointed out the inequality in the number of males and females in Exp. 2. This inequality resulted from a shortage of male participants. However, males were randomly allocated to experimental conditions so the representation of males was kept as equal as possible across conditions (p. ).
* The reviewer mentioned that the tables and the figures provide the same information and are therefore redundant, I accept this comment and so removed the tables from the MS.
* The reviewer drew my attention to two figures that looked the same. I have corrected this mistake and have now provided the right figures (p. ).
* I added to the text where to include the figures (p. ).
* In the discussion, I clarified the differences between the present study and that of Barel (2016) (p. ).
* I elaborated on the aspects of object location memory that can profit from automatic encoding (p. ).
* I added a limitation section to the discussion (p. ).
* I added a conclusion to the discussion (p. ).
* I changed "&" for "and" outside parentheses (p. ).
* I revised the references so they are now consistent in the use of upper and lower case in the title of the articles (p. ).

Second reviewer:

* In the introduction, I added the conditions and manipulations under which the sex differences in object location memory emerge (p. ).
* I added a description regarding the role of attention in memory (p. ) and I specified the conditions under which women outperform men in memory and attention tasks (p. ).
* In the introduction, I explained the difference between location-exchanged and location-maintained (p. ).
* I added the contribution of the present study to the research field compared to previous studies (p. ) including Barel's (2016) study (p. ).
* I defined the differences between incidental and intentional encoding (p. ), as well as between divided and full attention (p. ).
* The reviewer pointed out the absence of manipulation of selective attention. I agree with the reviewer, however in order to align with previous studies that used full attention manipulation, and with the former (Barel, 2016) study exploring the role of divided attention manipulation, the same conditions were used in the current study. Nevertheless, I addressed this comment as a limitation in the discussion section (p. ).
* The reviewer commented about the retention interval used in previous studies, and not in the present study. Indeed, this is an important factor influencing the diverse results obtained in former studies. I addressed this comment as a limitation in the discussion section (p. ).
* I added two figures showing the stimulus array before and after the encoding phase (p. ).
* I elaborated on the procedure used in the incidental condition, as well as in the divided attention condition (p. ).
* In the discussion, I addressed the nonsignificant effect of condition in the first experiment (p. ).
* I explained sex differences in the total, location-exchanged and in the location-maintained scores in Exp. 1 (p. ) and in Exp. 2 (p. ).
* I addressed the effectiveness of the attention manipulation in both experiments (p. )

and added Mack & Rock's suggestions about inattention and perception (1998) to the discussion (p. ).

* I replaced "tone detection" with "tone discrimination" throughout the MS (p. ).

Third reviewer:

* I added directed calculations of effect size (*Cohen's d*) for the estimation of sex differences under the full attention condition in order to compare them with previous findings (p. ).
* I added alternative factors for sex differences in the discussion (p. ).
* I addressed the hypothesized difference between men and women's encoding strategies under different conditions (p. ).
* I added error bars in Figs. 3 and 4 (p. ).
* The reviewer commented that the limitations of the study should be acknowledged. I added this to the discussion (p.
* I addressed the generalizability of the findings as a limitation in the discussion (p. ).

I believe I have addressed all the issues raised by the reviewers, and I hope you will find the article acceptable now for publication in the International Journal of Psychology.

I thank you again and look forward to hearing from you,

Efrat Barel