




JCR MANUSCRIPT REVIEW HISTORY 004-3 (REVIEWS)

Editor's Decision Letter

Thank you for resubmitting "The Influence of Ceiling Height: The Effect of Priming on the Type of Processing People Use." What you have presented here is excellent. Congratulations. The paper is accepted and will make a very nice contribution to JCR.

By the way, the publisher now offers web space to authors who want to post supplementary material related to their papers, such as stimuli. I don't know whether you have, for example, photographs of the room that you might want to post. If you do, it would need to be referenced in the manuscript with a web address which the publisher would supply.

Sincerely,



John Deighton

AE comments for the author(s)

You have done a nice job of dealing with virtually all the requests from the previous round of suggestions. There is one relatively minor issue that I would like to see you address differently – that of when or how you raise and deal with the ceiling height versus room volume issue.

I may be nit-picking, but in your reply to me you stated that room volume was part of your explanation, and not a counter-explanation. I suppose in a way this may be true, as you don't distinguish whether it is truly perceptions of height or

volume driving the effects (you could have designed studies that manipulated height, but not volume, but of course room dimensions would then change). I obviously don't think it's a critical issue, but I very much dislike the way you briefly raise room volume up front without going into it in any depth. Reviewer A raised this issue in the last round of reviews: "As is, the new comment on p. 5 about room volume doesn't quite fit. I think that you need to have more of a discussion of this when you bring it up." I believe the article will be that little bit better if you either (i) delete this statement from the introduction of the paper and only deal with the fact height and volume are inextricably linked when room dimensions are held constant in the GD, or (ii) take more of the approach to the issue you currently take in the GD in the introduction. My preference would be for (i).

Congratulations on a very interesting paper!