

RE: Manuscript 4280183

Dear Editors,

Thank you for the thoughtful review of our Brief Report resubmission, “Developing Methods for Observing Awe Narration in Psilocybin-Assisted Therapy”. Please accept our revised version here for further consideration of publication in *Healthcare*.

No authors have conflicts of interest to report and this manuscript is not under review elsewhere. Below is a point-by-point response to the reviewer critiques.

Sincerely,

Dr. Elise Tarbi

Reviewer Three

We synthesized the detailed comments from review 3 into 3 key points to which we respond below and revised the manuscript accordingly.

1. Increase clarity of language concerning scope and aim of the study at various points.

Response: We have taken these suggestions and adjusted language throughout where appropriate.

2. Clarify the nature of vastness as a required feature.

Response: We appreciate the proposed language and have updated the discussion section accordingly.

3. Provide additional statistical rigor

Response: We also agree that “percent agreement” can be an inflated and misleading measure of reliability, particularly when including the units of observation/analysis in which coders agreed a rare event (like Awe) was absent. However here we are not measuring inter-rater reliability, but rather exploring the conditions under which coders co-identify moments of awe narration to guide initial development of a coding system. Therefore, we remove the term, “agreement” and replace with “co-identification” to avoid this confusion.

We did both. First, we added mixed effects logistic regression for the purposes of addressing potential clustering by the 8 participant experiences. Second, we removed the inferential statistical test (chi square) and frame the results as descriptive.