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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have addressed almost all of my concerns and this has resulted in a much improved version of the paper. The only thing I have been deliberating is their decision to refrain from doing an extra experiment. Both Megan Smith and I pointed out that the immediate test may contaminate the results because it does not permit for a clear delayed-test comparison between a condition with retrieval practice and the two other conditions. After all, after the immediate test, all three conditions engaged in retrieval practice and this may have influenced the pattern on the delayed test. The mere fact that forgetting took place between the immediate and the delayed test does not alter the contamination argument (it only argues against freezing without forgetting). That is, it may be that the delayed test shows the same pattern of results as the immediate test, but only at a lower level of performance. However, addressing this issue in the discussion of the paper would be an acceptable solution to me.

Finally, a minor point. In the Coppens et al reference, the journal name should not be in capital letters.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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