Dear Professor Russ, Editor

*JMB*

Below please find my responses to the helpful comments made by you and the two anonymous reviewers. I was glad to read that both reviewers liked my “two-factor theory of understanding” and provided many useful suggestions to improve the paper. Please convey my thanks to them. Thank you.

I mentioned my gratitude to you and the reviewers in a footnote.

**The editor of *JMB***

1. **Notated MS:** I made all the corrections suggested in the MS.
2. **Suggestions – Abbreviations:** Except for TFTU for ‘Two Factor Theory of Understanding,’ and URP for ‘unknown real process,’ I did not use any other abbreviations.
3. **Suggestions – religion etc.:** I deleted the whole section about religion and made a short footnote of it. (P. 14, note 5).

**The first sentence in the abstract** – it seems OK to me.

**P. 21**: I added a new sentence.

**4. Suggestions – Aristotle:** I deleted the part of the sentence that brings up the questions. (p. 13, Line 1-3 – revised MS)

1. **Suggestions – desire/belief etc.:** I defined [desire/belief] – p. 15 (rMS)

**Question:** I clarified the issue. - p. 21 (rMS)

**p. 20, L 4**: I made it specific. - p. 21 (rMS)

**Dilemma**: I call it the methodological dilemma. - p. 22 (rMS)

**Mary**: I summarized Bourget’s approach briefly. - p. 24 (rMS)

1. **German translation:** I decided to delete the German translations.
2. **References:** I made all of the proposed corrections.
3. **Reviewers:** Please see below my analysis and reply to the reviewers.

**Reviewer A**

1. **Riding a bike:** The reviewer is correct, and I included a sentence in brackets mentioning that learning a skill involves consciousness. (p. 5).
2. **Fitting new information:** I believe that the reviewer’s comment is correct here too. However, since s/he mentioned that the fitting processes ‘obviously’ involve interaction between conscious and unconscious information, i.e., it is a self-understood topic, I decided to leave the text as it is.
3. **Paradigm change:** The reviewer is correct that in many cases one experiences a less dramatic change in order to accept new information – I mention this in between parentheses. (P. 6).
4. **Understanding-Distance = F (Theory – URP):** I add an explanation to F. (p. 7).
5. **Religion:** I accept reviewer’s suggestion and refer to the religion example in a footnote (note 5).
6. **UD:** I accept reviewer’s suggestion and replace UD byUnderstanding-Distance.
7. **URP as Noumena:** I see the reviewer’s point but decided not to discuss it, because of the huge complexity of this Kantian concept, which is above and beyond the purpose of the present paper, and because URP refers not to the ‘thing in itself’, but to the assumption about the unknown real processes that explains how humans behave.
8. **Empirical:** I believe that everybody understands the difference between an empirical theory that relates to empirical observations and theoretical theories (philosophical, mathematical etc.). So I believe that additional clarifications are not needed.
9. **Inner world:** I clarified this concept. (pp. 14-15).

**Reviewer B**

1. **Explanatory spectrum:** Reviewer B raises here a very deep and broad topic, which in my view is beyond the paper’s range. It is not a minor point: the question as to whether or not there is an accepted scientific methodology and even the delineation of ‘spectrum’ or ‘continuum’, are very complex topics. The point I wish to stress here can be maximized by talking of two kinds of explanation/understanding: scientific and everyday procedures.
2. **Plantinga’s approach and Religion:** Plantinga’s approach is very interesting and even in a certain way may be considered tempting: perception of a red flower, a memory of an episode, and even belief in God – all can be conceived as basic beliefs that do not need support by evidence (rational, observational). Reviewer B suggests that one may justify ‘everyday understanding’ on the basis of Plantinga’s approach. I found this proposal, although interesting, far beyond the present paper’s goal. First, Plantinga’s approach has been criticized severely (personally, I see there a lot of cracks); second, Plantinga’s epistemology is deeply involved with religious topics (belief in God is a basic one); third, ‘everyday understanding’ is not delineated here by anchoring it to a kind of “axiomatic set of beliefs” but rather by a comparison between the subjective mental world and the objective scientific methodology. Given these, I decided not to discuss Plantinga’s approach and to refer to religion in a footnote as proposed by reviewer A and the editor. (p. 13).
3. **Understanding-Distance:** In a footnote (p. 8) I related to this issue. I mentioned Bartlett and Holloway’s (2019)paperandpointed out one important difference between my suggestion and theirs. In p. 7, I grounded theUnderstanding-Distancein the methodological procedure of theory testing.

I am afraid that the interesting theoretical connections reviewer B makes to the present topic – such as James’s pragmatism (in my view not everything comes down to the criterion of a best result), ‘belief in other minds’, Polanyi’s philosophy (in my view not everything is judged in terms of being socially privileged), definition of closeness, and an artist’s point of view – all these subjects need profound analyses, which cannot be encompassed in one article.

1. **Consciousness and understanding:** Reviewer B proposed that I mention Searle’s thought-experiment – I cited Rakover (2018) in which I reviewed Searle and other philosophical approaches to consciousness.
2. **Religion:** As mentioned in 2. above, the whole section regarding religion has been shortened significantly and transferred to a footnote.