**Dear Dr. Steindel,**

**We would like to thank you for your rapid response and attention to our manuscript.**

**In line with the editorial comments and alterations, we have revised our manuscript to best follow the format for JoVE and to increase legibility. Below you can find our specific responses to the editorial comments.**

**Sincerely,**

**Ryan Hackländer and Christina Bermeitinger**

**Editorial comments:**  
  
**Note that some formatting changes have been made. Also, it is acceptible to solely use a table for results.**

We appreciate the editor’s assistance with the formatting changes. Furthermore, we thank the editor for informing us about the ability to use a table to present our results.

**1. It’s fine to have the protocol sections on options in stimulus selection and odor presentation, but they must be in the imperative with occasional non-imperative ‘Notes’. I’ve mostly changed section 3, but 4 was less clear—some of that information may better be in the discussion, and parts directly relevant to how the experiment in Section 2 was run (e.g., flow rates and presentation control) should probably be moved there. Other highlighted parts in 4 involve vague decision making, not discrete actions done in a real-world setting, and cannot be filmed.**

We appreciate the editor’s attention to our manuscript. We especially appreciate the improved legibility of section 3.

We appreciate the editor’s suggestions concerning our formulations and formatting in section 4. We have now removed section 4 as an independent part of the paper and have moved the relevant information to other sections (section 2 and the discussion), based on where it was most appropriate. Furthermore, we have altered the wording to better reflect the language used in the other sections. Finally, we have revised our highlighting, so as to ensure that only clear and filmable sections are highlighted.

**2. The link in reference 20 does not work.**

We apologize for this inconvenience. We have now actually replaced the reference with a peer reviewed article which includes more of a focus on olfactory processing times:

Herz, R., Engen, T. Odor memory: Review and analysis. *Psychon Bull Rev*. 3, 300-313 (1996).

As a matter of completeness, we here include a working link to the originally cited paper:

<http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/rob/Courses/InformationInSpeech/CDROM/Literature/LOTwinterschool2006/biae.clemson.edu/bpc/bp/Lab/110/reaction.htm>