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Reviewer’s report:

Overall I think this is well written and will be of some interest, mainly to those of us already in the synaesthesia field. I think there are some omissions and have some minor quibbles, outlined below. (Consider these as all under the heading of "Minor Essential Revisions").

1) In general, there is very little detail on methods. For example, how did the patient report his colour experiences? I assume using some kind of computerized colour picker, but this needs to be made clear. With the arrays of words, how long were they presented, how often did responses need to be made, etc? How did the rotation and morphing trials work, exactly, and how did you determine that the change from blue to black was abrupt?

2) You describe the experiences in some detail, but you do not go into any detail about the perceived location of the blue colour - i.e. is it in "the mind's eye" or does he see it physically on the page? Cf. Dixon, Smilek, & Merikle, 2004, and Ward, Li, Salih & Sagiv, 2007.

3) There is a description of fonts affecting the quality of synaesthetic experience in Ramachandran & Hubbard, 2001 (your second reference), footnote 8.

4) Your last paragraph is accurate, but I am not sure of its connection to your case study. It is true that your patient's synaesthesia has some conceptual aspects to its inducing (since the identical stimulus both does and does not produce a synaesthetic experience depending on context), but you need to make this connection clearer.
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