**Response to Reviewer Comments**

**Editor:**

*1. Please ensure that all text in the protocol section is written in the imperative tense as if telling someone how to do the technique (e.g., “Do this,” “Ensure that,” etc.). The actions should be described in the imperative tense in complete sentences wherever possible. Avoid usage of phrases such as “could be,” “should be,” and “would be” throughout the Protocol. Any text that cannot be written in the imperative tense may be added as a “Note.” However, notes should be concise and used sparingly.*

Documented changes have been made in the protocol section to adhere to JoVE’s protocol guidelines, in addition to updating the protocol step numbers.

*2. Please specify how to calculate the monitor size through Javascript in step 2.1.1.3.*

Calculations for monitor size through JavaScript have been clarified in Step 2.1.3 (previously Step 2.1.1.3). Specifically, monitor size is obtained using JavaScript’s *screen.width* and *screen.height* properties to determine the diagonal size of the monitor in pixels, and then this value is converted to inches using the pixel-to-inch ratio calculated in Step 2.1.2.

*3. There is 10 page limit for the Protocol, but there is a 2.75 page limit for filmable content. Please highlight 2.75 pages or less of the Protocol (including headings and spacing) that identifies the essential steps of the protocol for the video, i.e., the steps that should be visualized to tell the most cohesive story of the Protocol. The highlighted steps should form a cohesive narrative with a logical flow from one highlighted step to the next.*

The highlighted text has been updated to be only 2.75 pages long.

**Reviewer #1:**   
  
*1. It would be great whether this method would be applied to tablets/I-pad (with bluetooth keyboard) given that many users don't use PC anymore. Would that be possible (one day)?*

This comment has been addressed in the last paragraph of the Discussion (page 10) to indicate that future work could easily incorporate a more tablet-friendly interface in order to reach a larger pool of participants.

*2. Additionally, to evaluate the robustness of the results it would be useful, for both the UFOV and MOT scores to calculate Bayesian information criteria (BIC) values to estimate a Bayes factor and generate the posterior probability associated with the occurrence of the null (H0) and alternative (H1) hypotheses, given the observed data (Wagenmakers, 2007). This method allows making inferences about both significant and nonsignificant effects by providing the exact probability of their occurrence.  
  
Otherwise, the authors could include confidence interval (CI).*

The confidence intervals have been included for both the UFOV results (page 8, 1st paragraph) and the MOT results (page 8, 2nd paragraph).

**Reviewer #2:**   
  
*1. For the spatial parameters the viewing distance wasn't fixed. These likely will differ between laptops, desktops and tablets and the request for subjects to sit at arms-length will introduce systematic sex differences and age differences. It would be useful to have people get a tape measure and just simply measure a distance. There can be fall-backs in cases that there aren't exact measuring devices (like 3-paper widths or something). This all said, I don't think that the spatial issue is a major source of concern provided that the systematic biases introduced by arm-length are avoided.*

We agree that it is possible that differences in viewing distance were introduced due to the variety of devices used and also due to differences in participants’ heights, which affects a participant’s arm length. However, we do not find sex differences to be a major concern; in the manuscript, we have now reported the median forward arm-reaching lengths for U.S. male and female adults (page 9, last paragraph; and also a new citation [#11]) to note that sex differences for arm-reach are small; as a result, potential sex biases should be negligible with the amount of noise in the data. Additionally, participants were 18 or older, so age effects for viewing distance are not a large concern. The age range of participants has been included in the Discussion (page 9, 2nd paragraph in Discussion) for clarification of participant demographics.

*2. For temporal parameters, I agree that stepping through frame intervals make sense, however, there was limited description regarding for how thresholds were calculated based upon the actual refresh of the display. At one point it was suggested that timing information was collected (although I am curious how accurate these measures are and how they vary across devices), however, it wasn't discussed how this information was used in the data analysis. More details of this should be provided as it is one of the most significant issues of experimental control in psychophysical research.*

More details regarding the measure of thresholds have been added in the Representative Results (page 8, 1st paragraph) and in the Discussion (page 10,1st full paragraph); it has been clarified that timing measurements were obtained using the participant’s system clock for more accurate presentation times to use for threshold calculation. We acknowledge that variability still exists amongst participants’ screens (typically using LCD technology) that cannot be accounted for via the system clock. We noted that we minimized differences between frame images in order to limit the variability inherent in individual monitors’ response times and onset/offset times. Our results obtained suggest that monitor display timing for participants is comparable to timing of monitors used in the lab setting.  
  
*3. There are very long tails in figure 4, it would be useful to discuss these and related them to potential limitations of the approach. Likewise, it would be nice to see a distribution of UFOV thresholds from their laboratory studies to gain a better appreciation of how not just the mean but also the shape of the distribution is is impacted by noise factors introduced by the online procedure.*

We have included skewness and kurtosis information about the online data set (page 8, 1st paragraph). Discussion of the differences in skew between the online data and lab-based data has been added, indicating that the online data set is more right skewed (page 9, 2nd paragraph in Discussion). Differences have been attributed to participant differences in age and also to differences in sample sizes between the two studies, rather than a limitation of an online approach.