Spoiled for choice?

Uncertainty facing options in translation

**Review report**

We would like to thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions. We have followed the recommendations of reviewer B and have made the following changes (highlighted in yellow in the text):

* In the abstract, we have replaced "hesitation indicators" with "hesitation indicator types".
* On page 2, paragraph 1, we have replaced “described” with “describes”. In the following paragraphs, we have followed the suggestion of reviewer B and have replaced the past tense with the present tense.
* On page 2, paragraph 1, we have followed the recommendation of reviewer B and have eliminated the allusions to the linearity of the processes of comprehension, transfer and production.
* On page 2, paragraph 4, we have replaced “this kind” with “these kinds”.
* On page 2, last paragraph, a small clarification on uncertainty in machine translation has been added, following the reviewer's suggestion.
* On page 3, first paragraph, information about Carl's research on entropy has been added.
* Three papers by Carl and his team related to entropy have been added to the bibliography.
* On page 3, paragraph 3, we have added concrete examples of each of the concepts “indeterminacy”, “uncertainty”, and “hesitation.
* On page 4, paragraph 4, we have added a brief explanation about the number of choices potentially available for each text chunk.
* On page 4, paragraph 5, we have specified we have specified that what is quantified are the choices of the whole group and the individual hesitation indicators.
* On page 4, paragraph 6, we have mentioned the research on word translation entropy and the differences in approach with our work.
* On page 4, paragraph 7, we have explained the reasons why we used Inputlog in the classroom.
* On page 5, paragraph 1, we have explained why it was desirable to have as many interpersonal differences as possible.
* On page 5, paragraph 1, we have added information about source and target languages.
* On page 5, paragraph 2, we have removed the information about the dates of data collection.
* On page 5, paragraph 2, we have added information about the task.
* On page 5, last paragraph, we have added an example of physical cause of short pauses.
* On page 6, paragraph 1, we have added examples of reallocation of attentional resources.
* On page 6, paragraph 2, we have replaced “uncertainty indicators” with “hesitation indicator types”.
* On page 6, paragraph 3, we have added a short explanation about the exclusion of agrammatical text segments.
* On page 7, paragraph 1, we have added “such”.
* On page 7, paragraph 3, we have added a clarification in response to reviewer B's questions about the variation that resulted from the segmentation of the text.
* On page 8, paragraph 1, we have added an explanation trying to answer the questions posed by reviewer B.
* On page 9, paragraph 1, we have replaced “proceed calculating” with “proceed with calculating”.
* On page 10, paragraph 2, we have replaced “no complete” with “incomplete”.
* On page 18, in the title of the appendix, we have removed the reference to PETRA (as this group no longer exists) and added a reference to Muñoz and Cardona (2019).