REVIEWER A

The manuscript presents one study of the effect of divided attention on the production of false memories using the DRM paradigm, with recall and recognition tasks. The authors manipulated within-participants the attention focus using dichotic listening and shadowing. They expected a decrease of false memories principally in the unshadowed lists. The experiment showed an absence of significant differences between shadowing and dichotic conditions.

The theme of paper is interesting, however it is not clearly written and the experiment was not well-designed. The empirical contribution of the study is not clear due to lack of control of variables that may be affecting to the results. It is my opinion that the manuscript could be published in Psicológica, but it will take several changes that should be addressed in a new version of the paper. In what follows I offer an account of points that should be addressed:

1. The review of the literature presented in the Introduction is, in general, adequate.

2. Concerning the hypothesis: They expected a decrease of false recall and false recognition, particularly, in the unshadowed lists. However, the authors do not present clear specific predictions about the other two encoding manipulations: divided attention and shadowing. What are the predictions for each of those conditions?

3. Regarding the materials: The authors should make a more detailed characterization of the lists used in the experiment, Are these lists likely to show high incidence of false recall and false recognition? It is necessary to specify if the lists were BAS o FAS lists and their associative strength values. Also needed is information on what was the order of presentation of associates within the lists.

4. The number of lists used in the experiment seems very limited. Each participant receives only a presentation of divided attention, and the remaining trails were in the shadowed condition. In the study by Dewhurst et al (2007) the participants studied six DRM list with divided-attention and six with full attention. The authors should increase the number of study lists, three trials with divided-attention and three trials with shadowed presentation. I think that the authors should consider running a new experiment with more lists per condition.

5. About the Results: It is necessary a Table whit mean scores for correct recall of studied items, false recall of critical lures, false recall of other associated words, total related intrusions and unrelated intrusions as a function of divided attention and shadowing. The same for the recognition-test values.

6. Discussion: The authors do not find differences between the divided-attention and the shadowed conditions. This could be due to the small number of lists used in the experiment. The tendencies are observable in the figures, but there may be an insufficient number of lists and subjects, and the lack of differences is not caused by full attention, as the authors propose. The power of the experiment should be checked. Additionally, if the authors have used the same lists in other studies, and they have information on how these lists produce false

memories under standard, full-attention conditions, they could comment on the effect of introducing the different encoding manipulations in comparison with a condition in which those manipulations are not used.

REVIEWER B

In this study, the authors analyse the effect of dichotic listening and shadowing procedures on the production of false memories in the DRM paradigm. Results showed that production of false memories to the words processed in the unattended channels were not eliminated, independently of memory task – recall and recognition.

I like this manuscript and I think that the article is relevant for the journal. However, there are some issues.

1.- It is unclear to me what the new contribution from this research is. Other studies have also looked at encoding variables in the DRM paradigm. I think that the discussion section is in general well-organized, but could be tightened up a bit in order to make more evident and transparent what the new contribution is.

In addition, I consider that more theoretical and practical considerations are needed

2.- I believe that some re-writing needs to be done in the introduction section. The opening paragraphs are too general and do not really capture the focus of the article. The readers need more information about the role of impoverished encoding in the DRM paradigm.

3.- The main concern is the design and materials used in the experiment. The authors applied a within subject design, but some contrasts in this study might be better investigated in a between-participants design. The authors have to explain the reasons for choosing this design. From my point of view   6 lists of words (2 lists in each experimental condition) seems to be rather low to assess the real role of encoding strategies in this paradigm.

In sum, I think the manuscript is well written, the results are clear and deserves to be published.