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Dear

We are pleased to send you our revised manuscript, “The Relation between Sustained Attention and Incidental and Intentional Object-Location Memory.” We are grateful for the reviews and happy to learn that the reviewers acknowledged the potential contribution of our manuscript.

We followed the reviewers’ recommendations and made the following changes in the manuscript (colored in blue):

First reviewer:

* Reviewer 1 pointed out that the novelty of the present study is not clear. We addressed this point in the introduction (p.3).
* We elaborated on the relation between the research variables (p. 3).
* We justified the hypotheses (p. 3-4).
* We corrected the mistaken information regarding the procedure for the intentionalmemory*.* Indeed, all participants (both under incidental and intentionalconditions) underwent the same procedure, except the instruction regrading encoding (p. 5).
* We addressed the absence of full attention condition as a limitation in the discussion (p. 7).
* We reported power analysis in order to justify sample size (p. 5).
* We elaborated on the procedure regarding the study design (p. 5).
* Reviewer 1 suggested to add a corrected score for memory performance without false alarm marks. We added the corrected score and the relevant hypotheses testing (p.6-7).
* We rewrote the sentence regarding incidental and intentional memory findings (p. 1).
* Reviewer 1 suggested reviewing the literature regarding object-location binding in the realm of visual short-term memory. We cited Treisman and Zhang' paper and elaborated on this issue (p. 2).
* We elaborated on the rational regarding Ecuyer-Dab and Robert (2007) study (p.2).
* We provided description of the PVT task (p. 4).

Second reviewer:

* We addressed the potential interference resulting from tasks order in the discussion (p. 7-8).
* Reviewer 2 suggested to acknowledge of the weakness of using the PVT task as a measure of sustained attention. We addressed it as a limitation (p. 8).
* We added the correlation analysis between incidental and intentional memory performance (p.6) and addressed the diffrernt processing strategies on each task (p.2).
* We accepted Reviewer 2 suggestion and omitted the three sub measures of the PVT and used the aggregate score (p. 5-6).
* We added the comparison between correlations (p. )

Third reviewer:

* We elaborated on the choice of PVT-B as a sustained attention measure and cited relevant papers (p. 5).
* None of participants were sleep deprived and all fell in the typical range as measured by objective sleep measures (p. 6)
* We omitted the sentence regarding object identity and object-binding (p. 7).
* We integrated the current with previous findings in the discussion (p. 7).
* We rewrote the conclusion regarding memory performance under incidental and intentional conditions (p. 7).
* We removed the statement regarding animal and brain imaging studies in the discussion
* (p. 8).
* We bolded "method" and removed the bold from "participants"(p. 4).
* We provided the mean age of participants (p. )
* We corrected the typo for "in" (p. 4).
* We added the missing citation of Van Dongen in the references (p. 11).
* We corrected the differenct size font in Figure 1 (p. 6).
* We added the missing word in the legend for Figure 2 (p. 7).
* We corrected the grammatical error (p. 8).
* We wrote the reference Doi in separate line (p.

We believe that we have addressed all the issues raised in the reviews and hope that you will find the article acceptable for publication in the journal of *Brain Sciences*.

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

## Efrat Barel & Orna Tzischinsky