Dear Editors, July 20, 2018

Re: JoVE58557R1

We have revised the manuscript according to your and the reviewers’ comments. We have created a separate document responding to the reviewers’ comments. Our responses to your comments follow:

• **Introduction: Please expand to include advantages over alternative techniques and a description of the technique in the context of the wider literature.**

**RESPONSE:** The Introduction has been expanded to describe advantages of the decomposition technique compared to regression analyses yielding unique effects only. Also, a description of the context of the technique in the wider body of the Simple View of Reading literature has been added.

• **Protocol Language:** Please ensure that all text in the protocol section is written in the imperative voice/tense as if you are telling someone how to do the technique (i.e. “Do this”, “Measure that” etc.) Any text that cannot be written in the imperative tense may be added as a “Note”, however, notes should be used sparingly and actions should be described in the imperative tense wherever possible.  
  
1) Examples NOT in imperative voice: 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 4.

**RESPONSE: We have edited each of these sections, as well as others, to be more explicit in our use of imperative voice for instructions.**  
  
• **Protocol Detail:** Please note that your protocol will be used to generate the script for the video, and must contain everything that you would like shown in the video. **Please add more specific details (e.g. button clicks for software actions, numerical values for settings, etc) your protocol steps.** There should be enough detail in each step to supplement the actions seen in the video so that viewers can easily replicate the protocol.  
  
1) 1.1: It is unclear what kind of data this is. How was it obtained? What information does it contain? Please add a step or a note to mention this. Please describe in brief how the data was collected and cite any references to previous work where it is described in detail.

**Response: This information is now included at the end of the Introduction and in the Representative Results section. Because the presentation in the protocol is for a methodology and ubiquitous in application, we prefer to keep this information in those other two sections.**

2) 2.1: Define R2 here.

**Response: A definition of the R-squared is now included.**

3) 2.2: Unclear what X1 is here.  
4) 2.3: Unclear what X2 is here.

**Response: X1 and X2, though having substantive value for the representative results, are dummy coded as general independent variables for the purpose of highlighting the methodology of computing the unique, common, total, and unexplained variances.**

5) 4: Each section should have a set of substeps under it.

**Response: We have added additional substeps to section 4 to describe additional steps for creating a specific type of chart with the data (i.e., a pie chart).**

• **Protocol Highlight: Highlight steps to be visualized.**

**Response: We have highlighted steps to be visualized.**

• **Discussion:** Focus on modifications, limitations, significance with respect to existing methods, future applications, and critical steps within the protocol.

**Response: The Discussion has been rewritten to focus on these four elements, with a slightly different ordering: critical steps in the protocol, modifications, limitations and future applications, and significance with respect to existing methods.**

• **Figure legends:** Please expand legends to adequately describe the figures, with a short title, followed by a short description of each panel and/or a general description.

**Response**: Each of the 3 figures now has a short title and a short description of what is in each part of the pie chart. These original figures are now .TIF.

• **Commercial Language and Table of Materials:** Please replace commercial sounding language with generic language.

**Response:** All mention of commercial products have been removed and placed in the Table of Materials. They have been replaced with the generic terms “software with a graphical user interface” and “data management software.”

We have responded to the reviewers’ comments in a separate rebuttal file and have revised the manuscript based on several comments. We have carefully proofed this revision and feel confident that it is error free.

Sincerely,



Barbara R. Foorman, Ph.D.

Francis Eppes Professor of Education

Director Emeritus, Florida Center for Reading Research

Director, Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Southeast

Florida State University