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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 the revision for my manuscript: “Effects of attention during encoding on sex differences in object location memory.” I am grateful for the reviews and happy to learn that the reviewers acknowledged the potential contribution of my manuscript.

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

First reviewer:

* In the Introduction, I explained what the present work adds to the previous knowledge (p.
* I clarified the differences between the present MS and Barel (2016) (p..
* I added the publication year of Barel' paper in the References (p. ) as well in several places in the MS (p.
* As reviewer 1 suggested, I elaborated on the results of divided vs. selective attention tasks in previous findings (p.) and on findings regarding attention and memory (p.
* I added two figures showing of the stimulus array before and following the encoding phase (p.
* Reviewer 1 pointed to 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 experiment conditions retaining equal representation of males as possible across conditions (p.
* Reviewer 1 mentioned that the tables and the figures provide the same information and therefore redundant, I accepted the comment and removed the tables from the MS.
* Reviewer 1 has drawn my attention that the two figures look the same. I corrected the mistake and provided the right figures (p.
* I mentioned in 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 can profit from automatic encoding (p.
* I added a Limitation section in the Discussion (p.
* I added a Conclusion in the Discussion (p.
* I changed "&" for "and" outside parenthesis (p.
* I revised the References to be 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 on
* 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 the research field compared with previous studies (p. including Barel' (2016) study (p.
* I defined the differences between incidental and intentional encoding (p., as well as between divided and full attention (p.
* Reviewer 2 commented as for the absence of manipulating selective attention. I agree with the reviewer, however in order to align with previous studies conducting full attention manipulation, and with the former (Barel, 2016) study exploring the role of divided attention manipulation, the same vain has retained. Nevertheless, I addressed this comment as a limitation in the Discussion section (p.).
* Reviewer 2 commented as for the retention interval used in previous studies, and not in the present study. Indeed this is important factor influencing the diversity results obtained in former studies. I addressed this comment as a limitation in the Discussion section (p.).
* I added two figures showing of the stimulus array before and following the encoding phase (p.
* I elaborated on the procedure used in the incidental condition, as well as in the divided attention condition (p.
* In 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' suggestions as for inattention and perception (1998) in the Discussion (

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

Third reviewer:

* I added directed calculations of effect size (*Cohen's d*) for the estimation of sex differences under 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's and women's encoding strategies under different conditions (p.
* I added error bars in Fig. 3 and 4 (p.
* Reviewer 3 commented that the limitations of the study should be acknowleged. I added this section in the Discussion (p.
* I addressed the generalizability of the findings as a limitation in the Discussion (p.

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

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

Efrat Barel