

Journal of Visualized Experiments

Methods to Test Visual Attention Online

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	JoVE52470R1
Full Title:	Methods to Test Visual Attention Online
Article Type:	Invited Methods Article - JoVE Produced Video
Keywords:	behavior; visual attention; web-based assessment; computer-based assessment; visual search; multiple object tracking
Manuscript Classifications:	6.2.463.593.932: Visual Perception; 6.2.830.104.214: Attention; 6.4.96.144: Behavioral Research
Corresponding Author:	Amanda Yung University of Rochester Rochester, NY UNITED STATES
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	ayung@cvs.rochester.edu
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Rochester
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Amanda Yung
First Author Secondary Information:	
Other Authors:	Pedro Cardoso-Leite, PhD
	Gillian Dale, PhD
	Daphne Bavelier, PhD
	C. Shawn Green, PhD
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	Online data collection methods have particular appeal to behavioral scientists because they offer the promise of much larger and much more representative data samples than can typically be collected on college campuses. However, before such methods can be widely adopted, a number of technological challenges must be overcome - in particular in experiments where tight control over stimulus properties is necessary. Here we present methods for collecting performance data on two tests of visual attention. Both tests require control over the visual angle of the stimuli (which in turn requires knowledge of the viewing distance, monitor size, screen resolution, etc.) and the timing of the stimuli (as the tests involve either briefly flashed stimuli or stimuli that move at specific rates). Data collected on these tests from over 1700 online participants were consistent with data collected in laboratory-based versions of the exact same tests. These results suggest that with proper care, timing/stimulus size dependent tasks can be deployed in web-based settings.
Author Comments:	
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
If this article needs to be "in-press" by a certain date to satisfy grant requirements, please indicate the date below and explain in your cover letter.	
If this article needs to be filmed by a	

certain date to due to
author/equipment/lab availability, please
indicate the date below and explain in
your cover letter.

TITLE:

Methods to Test Visual Attention Online

AUTHORS:

Yung, Amanda
Center for Visual Science
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY
ayung@cvs.rochester.edu
585.273.3970

Cardoso-Leite, Pedro
Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences
University of Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland
Pedro.CardosoLeite@unige.ch

Dale, Gillian
Department of Psychology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI
gdale2@wisc.edu

Bavelier, Daphne
Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY

Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences
University of Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland
Daphne.Bavelier@unige.ch

Green, C. Shawn
Department of Psychology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI
csgreen2@wisc.edu

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: Amanda Yung

KEYWORDS:

behavior, visual attention, web-based assessment, computer-based assessment, visual search, multiple object tracking

SHORT ABSTRACT:

To replicate laboratory settings, online data collection methods for visual tasks require tight control over stimulus presentation. We outline methods for the use of a web application to collect performance data on two tests of visual attention.

LONG ABSTRACT:

Online data collection methods have particular appeal to behavioral scientists because they offer the promise of much larger and much more representative data samples than can typically be collected on college campuses. However, before such methods can be widely adopted, a number of technological challenges must be overcome – in particular in experiments where tight control over stimulus properties is necessary. Here we present methods for collecting performance data on two tests of visual attention. Both tests require control over the visual angle of the stimuli (which in turn requires knowledge of the viewing distance, monitor size, screen resolution, *etc.*) and the timing of the stimuli (as the tests involve either briefly flashed stimuli or stimuli that move at specific rates). Data collected on these tests from over 1700 online participants were consistent with data collected in laboratory-based versions of the exact same tests. These results suggest that with proper care, timing/stimulus size dependent tasks can be deployed in web-based settings.

INTRODUCTION:

Over the past five years there has been a surge of interest in the use of online behavioral data collection methods. While the vast majority of publications in the domain of psychology have utilized potentially non-representative subject populations¹ (*i.e.*, primarily college undergraduates) and often reasonably small sample sizes as well (*i.e.*, typically in the range of tens of subjects), online methods offer the promise of far more diverse and larger samples. For instance, Amazon’s Mechanical Turk service has been the subject of a number of recent studies, both describing the characteristics of the “worker” population and the use of this population in behavioral research²⁻⁶.

However, one significant concern related to such methods is the relative lack of control over critical stimulus variables. For example, in most visual psychophysics tasks, stimuli are described in terms of visual angle. The calculation of visual angles requires precise measurements of viewing distance, screen size, and screen resolution. While these parameters are trivial to measure and control in a lab setting (where there is a known monitor and participants view stimuli while in a chin rest placed a known distance from the monitor), the same is not true of online data collection. In an online environment, not only will participants inevitably use a wide variety of monitors of different sizes with different software settings, they also may not have easy access to rulers/tape measures that would allow them to determine their monitor size or have the knowledge necessary to determine their software and hardware settings (*e.g.*, refresh rate, resolution).

Here we describe a set of methods to collect data on two well-known tests of visual attention – the Useful Field of View (UFOV) paradigm⁷ and the multiple object tracking (MOT) task⁸ – while

avoiding as much as possible the sources of variability that are inherent in online measurements. These tasks can be run by any participant with an internet connection and an HTML5 compatible browser. Participants who do not know their screen size are walked through a measurement process utilizing commonly available items of standard size (*i.e.*, credit card/CD – see Figure 1).

Data on these two tasks were collected from over 1700 participants in a Massive Online Open Course. Average performance of this online sample was highly consistent with results obtained in tightly controlled laboratory-based measures of the exact same tasks^{9,10}. Our results are thus consistent with the growing body of literature demonstrating the efficacy of online data collection methods, even in tasks that require specific control over viewing conditions.

PROTOCOL:

The protocol was approved by the institutional review board at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The following steps have been written as a guide for programmers to replicate the automated process of the web application described.

1. Login Participant

1.1) Instruct the participant to use an internet-enabled computer and navigate to the web application using an HTML5 compatible browser: <http://brainandlearning.org/jove>. Have participant sit in a quiet room free of distractions, with the computer at a comfortable height.

Note: Since the entire experiment is hosted online, the tasks can also be performed remotely without the presence of a research assistant. All instructions for the participant are included in the web application.

1.2) Have the participant input a unique ID that will be associated with the data collected and stored in a MySQL database. Have the participant reuse this ID if the online tasks are not completed within the same session. Before logging in, obtain consent from the participant via a consent form linked on the page.

Note: A participant's progress is saved after each task in order to allow for completion of the two tasks at separate times if needed. Instruct the participant to always use the same ID in order to start where one left off.

2. Screen Calibration

Note: The web application guides the participant through the three steps outlined in the calibration page at: <http://brainandlearning.org/jove/Calibration>

2.1) Ask the participant to input the diagonal size of the screen in inches in the labeled textbox.

2.1.1) However, if the participant does not know this information, have the participant find a CD or credit card as a calibration object (Figure 1). When one is selected, prompt the participant to place the object against the screen and align it with a representative image of the object displayed on the screen.

2.1.2) Prompt the participant to adjust the size of the screen image to match the size of the physical object. Based on the measurements of a physical CD (diameter of 4.7") or a credit card (width of 3.2") in addition to the pixel size of the representative image, determine the ratio of pixels to inches for the screen.

2.1.3) Retrieve the pixel resolution of the monitor via JavaScript's *screen.width* and *screen.height* properties to then calculate the diagonal size of the screen in pixels. Knowing this value and the previously estimated pixel-to-inch ratio (see 2.1.2), convert the diagonal size to inches. Have the participant confirm this value through a dialog box.

2.2) Prompt the participant to adjust the screen brightness settings until all 12 bands in a black-to-white gradient displayed on the screen are clearly distinguishable. Brightness setting controls vary by computer.

2.3) Ask the participant to sit an arm's length away from the monitor in a comfortable position and then set the browser window to full screen mode. The browser window must be in full screen mode to maximize the visual space used by the tasks and to remove any visual distractions, such as the browser toolbar and desktop taskbars.

2.4) Knowing the resolution of the participant's screen and the diagonal size of the monitor, use the web application to automatically calculate the pixels/degree conversion value, based on a 50 cm viewing distance. Resize the dimensions of the stimuli in the tasks using this value. All visual angle dimensions reported below are based on this assumed mean distance value from the monitor.

2.5) Once calibration is complete, ask the participant to complete the two tasks described below. Choose the order of the tasks or randomly assign the order via the web application.

3. Multiple Object Tracking Task (MOT) – Figure 2

3.1) Introduce and familiarize the participant with the MOT stimuli through a self-guided tutorial, seen at: <http://brainandlearning.org/jove/MOT/practice.php>. Ask the participant to read step-by-step instructions that demonstrate how the trials will work. Once the participant finishes reading the instructions, prompt the participant to go through the practice trials.

3.1.1) Setup the practice stimuli to consist of 8 dots at 0.8° with a movement speed of $2^\circ/\text{sec}$. Use the HTML5 *requestAnimationFrame* API to optimize browser animation at a frame rate of 60 Hz in order to control this stimulus motion.

3.1.2) Ensure the dots move within the boundaries of a circle of 2° eccentricity and a circle no larger than the height of the participant's screen, without the instructions obscured.

3.1.3) Set the dots to move in a random trajectory, where at each frame a dot has a 60% chance of changing direction by a maximum angle of 0.2° . If a dot collides with another dot or the inner or outer radial limits, move the dot in the opposite direction.

3.1.4) Prompt the participant to track the blue dots (varying between 1 and 2 dots per practice trial), with the yellow dots acting as distractors.

3.1.5) After 2 sec, change the blue dots to yellow dots and continue to move them amongst the original yellow dots for another 4 sec. At the end of each trial, stop the dots and highlight one.

3.1.6) Prompt the participant to respond via key press whether the highlighted dot was a tracked dot or a distractor dot. Next, prompt the participant to press the space bar to continue onto the next trial.

3.1.7) After 3 consecutive correct trials, or a maximum of 6 trials, move the participant onto the full task.

3.2) Start the full MOT task for the participant. An example of the task can be found at: <http://brainandlearning.org/jove/MOT>

3.2.1) Setup the full task with 16 dots that move at $5^\circ/\text{sec}$ within the space between 2° eccentricity and 10° eccentricity. If the participant's screen cannot fit a circle of 10° eccentricity, use the maximum size the screen can contain instead.

3.2.2) Have the participant complete a total of 45 trials: a mixture of 5 trials consisting of 1 tracked dot and 10 trials each consisting of 2-5 tracked dots. Match all other parameters to the practice trials (see 3.1.3 – 3.1.6).

3.2.3) Record the participant's response and response time once the dot is highlighted.

3.2.4) For every 15 trials, suggest a break to the participant. At these breaks, display the participant's performance (percent of correct trials) within the block on the screen.

4. Moving from One Task to Another (Optional Step)

4.1) Allow the participant to take a break between the two tasks. However, repeat steps 1 and 2 if the tasks are not completed during the same login session.

5. Useful Field of View Task (UFOV) – Figure 3

5.1) Introduce and familiarize the participant with the UFOV stimuli through a self-guided

tutorial, seen at: <http://brainandlearning.org/jove/UFOV/practice.php>. Ask the participant to go through 4 stages of step-by-step instructions that demonstrate the two target stimuli that must be attended to during the task.

5.1.1) Set the central target stimulus as a 1° smiley that flashes at the center of the screen with either long or short hair. Randomize the smiley's hair length across trials.

5.1.2) Set the peripheral target stimulus as a 1° star that flashes at 4° eccentricity at one of 8 locations around the circle (0°, 45°, 90°, 135°, 180°, 225°, 270°, and 315°). Randomize the location of the star across trials.

5.1.3) Control stimulus duration via number of frames used for presentation time. Optimize frame refresh at about 17 ms per frame by using the HTML5 *requestAnimationFrame* API (see 2.1.3).

5.1.4) To check if the expected presentation time was achieved, use JavaScript's *getTime()* method to obtain the stimulus duration's start time and end time based on the participant's system clock. Calculate the measured presentation time from these two values and use this value for data analysis.

5.1.5) For each practice trial, wait 500 ms before displaying the stimuli for approximately 200 ms (about 12 frames).

5.1.6) Follow stimulus presentation with a noise mask composed of a randomly generated grayscale dot array for 320 ms (about 19 frames).

5.1.7) For stage 1, only display the central target and then prompt the participant to respond via key press which hair length was displayed.

5.1.8) For stage 2, only display the peripheral target and then prompt the participant to click on one of 8 radial lines, representing the 8 possible target locations, to indicate where the star appeared.

5.1.9) For stage 3, display both central and peripheral target stimuli and then prompt the participant to provide responses to both the type of smiley and the location of the star.

Note: Participants can freely choose the order of these two responses.

5.1.10) For stage 4, display both target stimuli in addition to peripheral distractors, and then prompt the participant to respond to both target stimuli. For the distractors, display 1° squares presented at the remaining 7 locations at 4° eccentricity, in addition to 8 more squares at 2° eccentricity.

5.1.11) After the participant's response, show the participant feedback (a green checkmark for

a correct answer or a red cross for an incorrect answer) for each target response after each trial.

5.1.12) Move the participant onto the next practice stage after getting 3 consecutive correct trials. After stage 4, move the participant onto the full task.

5.2) Prompt the participant to start the full UFOV task. An example of the task can be found at: <http://brainandlearning.org/jove/UFOV>

5.2.1) Present the same central stimulus as in the practice session (see 5.1.1). Display the peripheral target at 7° eccentricity at one of the previously mentioned 8 locations (see 5.1.2). 24 distractor squares are also displayed at 3° eccentricity, 5° eccentricity, and the remaining 7° eccentricity locations.

5.2.2) Use a 3-down, 1-up staircase procedure to determine the presentation time of the stimuli: decrease the duration of stimuli after 3 consecutive correct trials and increase after each error trial.

5.2.3) Before the first 3 reversals in the staircase, use a step size of 2 frames (approximately every 33 ms). After 3 reversals, use a step size of 1 frame. Vary the delay before the stimulus onset between 1 frame and 99 frames per trial, and keep the noise mask duration at 320 ms (about 19 frames).

Note: Reversals are the points at which the duration changes – either from increasing to decreasing, or decreasing to increasing.

5.2.4) End the task when one of three conditions is met: the staircase procedure reaches 8 reversals; the participant completes 10 consecutive trials at either the ceiling duration (99 frames) or the floor duration (1 frame); or the participant reaches a maximum of 72 trials.

5.2.5) Record the participant's response and response time for both the central stimulus and the peripheral stimulus.

REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:

Outlier Removal

A total of 1779 participants completed the UFOV task. Of those, 32 participants had UFOV thresholds that were greater than 3 standard deviations from the mean, suggesting that they were unable to perform the task as instructed. As such, the UFOV data from these participants were removed from the final analysis, leaving a total of 1747 participants.

Data were obtained from 1746 participants for the MOT task. Two participants had mean accuracy scores that were more than 3 standard deviations below the mean, thus the data from these participants were removed from the final MOT analysis, leaving a total of 1744 participants.

UFOV

For the UFOV task, performance was calculated by averaging the presentation time over the final 5 trials in order to obtain a detection threshold. The presentation time reflected the measured stimulus presentation duration on each participant's screen: the time from the start of the first stimulus frame until the end the last stimulus frame was recorded in milliseconds using the participant's system clock. The detection threshold reflects the minimum presentation duration at which the participants can detect the peripheral target with approximately 79% accuracy, given our use of a 3-down, 1-up staircase procedure. The mean UFOV threshold was 64.7 ms ($SD = 53.5$, 95% CI [62.17, 67.19]) and scores ranged from 17 ms to 315 ms with a median threshold of 45 ms (see Figure 4). The threshold distribution was positively skewed, with skewness of 1.92 ($SE = .06$) and kurtosis of 3.93 ($SE = .12$).

MOT

MOT performance was measured by calculating the mean accuracy (percent correct) for each set size (1-5). Accuracy ranged from 0.4 – 1.0 for set size 1 to 0.1 – 1.0 for set size 5, and mean accuracy ranged from .99 ($SD = .06$, 95% CI [.983, .989]) for set size 1 to .71 ($SD = .17$, 95% CI [.700, .716]) for set size 5. The median accuracy scores ranged from 1.0 to .70 for set size 1 and 5 respectively (see Figure 5).

A repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted to examine whether accuracy differed as a function of set size. There was a significant main effect of set size ($F(4, 6968) = 1574.70$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .475$) such that accuracy decreased as set size increased, demonstrating a typical MOT effect.

Figure 1: Screen measurement. Because not all online participants know their screen size – or have easy access to a ruler/tape measure to assess their screen size – the calibration process asked subjects to utilize commonly available items of standard size (credit card – above; CD – below).

Figure 2: MOT Task. Participants viewed a set of randomly moving dots. At trial onset, a subset of these dots was blue (targets), while the remainder were yellow (distractors). After 2 seconds the blue target dots changed to yellow, making them visually indistinguishable from the distractors. Participants had to mentally track the formerly blue target dots for 4 seconds until a response screen appeared. On this screen one of the dots was white and the subject made a “yes (this was one of the original targets)” or “no (this was not one of the original targets)” decision (with a key press).

Figure 3: UFOV Task. The main screen consisted of a central stimulus (a yellow smiley that could have either short or long hair), a peripheral stimulus (a filled white star inside a circle) and peripheral distractors (white outlined squares). This screen was briefly flashed (with the timing determined adaptively based on participant performance). When the response screen appeared the participant had to make two responses: they had to indicate (with a key press) whether the smiley had long or short hair and they had to indicate (by clicking) on which of the

8 radial spokes the target stimulus appeared. They then received feedback about both responses (here they chose the correct answer for the central task, but the incorrect answer for the peripheral task).

Figure 4: UFOV Results. As is clear from the histogram of subject performance, not only could the vast majority of the participants perform the task as instructed (~1% removed for poor/outlier performance), the mean performance was squarely in the range expected from lab based measures on the exact same task⁹.

Figure 5: MOT Results. Consistent with previous work¹⁰, MOT accuracy fell off smoothly with increasing set size.

DISCUSSION:

Online data collection has a number of advantages over standard laboratory-based data collection. These include the potential to sample far more representative populations than the typical college undergraduate pool utilized in the field, and the ability to obtain far greater sample sizes in less time than it takes to obtain sample sizes that are an order of magnitude smaller in the lab¹⁻⁶ (*e.g.*, the data points collected from 1700+ participants in the current paper were obtained in less than one week).

The described online methods were able to replicate results obtained from previously conducted lab-based studies: calculated means and ranges for UFOV thresholds and MOT accuracy in the online tasks were comparable to results reported by Dye and Bavelier⁹ for the UFOV task and Green and Bavelier¹⁰ for the MOT task. However, the large participant sample did have an impact on the distribution of the results, particularly in the UFOV task. The online UFOV threshold distribution was more right skewed than previous laboratory-based results⁹. This difference in skew may be attributed to the greater diversity of participants recruited online, particularly in regards to their wider variation in age: the online sample ranged from 18-70 years, while the laboratory-based sample ranged from 18-22 years⁹.

Furthermore, collecting data via online methods does require solving several technical challenges – particularly when close stimulus control is necessary for the validity of the measures. The two tasks employed here required control over both the visual angle of the stimuli that were presented and the timing of the stimuli. Visual angle in particular can be difficult to control in online settings as its calculation requires knowing viewing distance, monitor size, and screen resolution. This is particularly problematic given that many online participants may not know their monitor size or have easy access to a tape measure in order to measure their monitor size.

We devised a series of steps to overcome some of these issues. While we can perfectly resolve monitor size, we still cannot precisely control the actual viewing distance. We suggest to participants to sit an arm's length away from the monitor, although this distance may vary among participants. Arm length was chosen, as U.S. anthropometric data indicates that the difference in length of a forward arm reach (the position in which participants would use to

judge their distance away from the screen) between male and female adults is small, such that the median male reach is 63.8 cm while the median female reach is 62.5 cm¹¹. Although the experiment setup procedure attempts to avoid introducing sex biases by using this measurement, there may be potential height biases; future studies that collect participants' height information would need to be conducted to assess this possibility.

As for stimulus timing, we took into account the discrepancies between expected duration and recorded duration of stimulus presentation when calculating threshold values. Rather than relying on the expected presentation duration, we measured the duration of the stimulus frames using the participant's system clock with millisecond precision. However, inherent disparities between monitor displays still were present and cannot be controlled for without physical in-situ measurements. It is well known that Liquid Crystal Displays (LCD)— the most likely monitors our participants have access to—have long response times that typically vary depending on the start and end values of the pixel luminance changes. The latter issue is not a concern in our study because we always switched from the same background level to stimulus level. A greater concern is that variability in displays across participants causes a large portion of the measured variance. We believe that this is not an issue as pixel response times are typically smaller than 1 frame rate (*i.e.*, 17 ms)^{12,13}, which seems acceptable in comparison to the large inter individual variability in UFOV thresholds.

The methods employed here overcome the aforementioned challenges and thus allowed us to measure performance on two tasks – the UFOV and the MOT - that both require control over visual angle and screen timing properties. The results obtained by these methods were consistent with those obtained in standard laboratory settings, thus demonstrating their validity. Additionally, because these tasks require only an internet connection and an HTML5 compatible browser, these tasks can be employed not only to easily gather a large sample from a generally representative population, but can also be used to reach specific sub-types of individuals that may be geographically separated and thus difficult to bring to a common lab setting (*e.g.*, patients with a certain type of disease or individuals with a certain ethnic background). Furthermore, with the rise of use of iPads and other tablets, the design of the web application could easily be adapted for better compatibility with touchscreen technology in order to reach an even greater number of participants. While the web application can currently run on tablets via an HTML5 browser, future iterations could remove the requirement of a keyboard and replace response keys with interface buttons or gestures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

This work was supported by the Swiss National Foundation (100014_140676) and the National Science Foundation (1227168).

DISCLOSURES:

The authors have nothing to disclose.

REFERENCES:

1. Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. The weirdest people in the world? *The Behavioral And Brain Sciences*. **33**, 61-135, doi: 10.1017/S0140525X0999152X (2010).
2. Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T. & Gosling, S. D. Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. **6** (1), 3-5 (2011).
3. Goodman, J. K., Cryder, C. E. & Cheema, A. Data collection in a flat world: the strengths and weaknesses of mechanical turk samples. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*. **26** (3), 213-224 (2013).
4. Mason, W. & Suri, S. Conducting behavioral research on Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods*. **44** (1), 1-23, doi: 10.3758/s13428-011-0124-6 (2012).
5. Crump, M. J., McDonnell, J. V. & Gureckis, T. M. Evaluating Amazon's Mechanical Turk as a tool for experimental behavioral research. *PLoS One*. **8**, e57410, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0057410 (2013).
6. Lupyan, G. The difficulties of executing simple algorithms: why brains make mistakes computers don't. *Cognition*. **129**, 615-636, doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2013.08.015 (2013).
7. Ball, K. & Owsley, C. The useful field of view test: a new technique for evaluating age-related declines in visual function. *J Am Optom Assoc*. **64** (1), 71-79 (1993).
8. Pylyshyn, Z. W. & Storm, R. W. Tracking multiple independent targets: Evidence for a parallel tracking mechanism. *Spatial Vision*. **3** (3), 179-197 (1988).
9. Dye, M. W. G. & Bavelier, D. Differential development of visual attention skills in school-age children. *Vision Research*. **50** (4), 452-459 (2010).
10. Green, C. S. & Bavelier, D. Enumeration versus multiple object tracking: The case of action video game players. *Cognition*. **101** (1), 217-245 (2006).
11. Eastman Kodak Company. Ergonomics Design Philosophy. In: *Kodak's Ergonomic Design for People at Work, 2nd Edition*. Chengalur, S. N., Rodgers S. H., & Bernard, T. E, eds., Chapter 1. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, NJ (2004).
12. Elze, T. & Bex, P. P1-7: Modern display technology in vision science: Assessment of OLED and LCD monitors for visual experiments. *i-Perception*. **3** (9), 621 (2012).
13. Elze, T. & Tanner, T. G. Temporal Properties of Liquid Crystal Displays: Implications for Vision Science Experiments. *PLoS One*. **7** (9), e44048. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0044048 (2012).

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Name of Reagent/ Equipment	Company	Catalog Number	Comments/Description
Computer/tablet	N/A	N/A	It must have an internet connection and an HTML5 compatible brow
CD or credit card	N/A	N/A	May not be needed if participant already knows the monitor size

/ser



1 Alewife Center #200
Cambridge, MA 02140
tel. 617.945.9051
www.jove.com

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

Title of Article:

Methods to Test Visual Attention Online

Author(s):

Amanda Yung, Pedro Cardoso-Leite, Gillian Dale,
Daphne Bavelier, C. Shawn Green

Item 1 (check one box): The Author elects to have the Materials be made available (as described at <http://www.jove.com/publish>) via: ☒ Standard Access ☐ Open Access

Item 2 (check one box):

- ☒ The Author is NOT a United States government employee.
- ☐ The Author is a United States government employee and the Materials were prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.
- ☐ The Author is a United States government employee but the Materials were NOT prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

1. **Defined Terms.** As used in this Article and Video License Agreement, the following terms shall have the following meanings: “**Agreement**” means this Article and Video License Agreement; “**Article**” means the article specified on the last page of this Agreement, including any associated materials such as texts, figures, tables, artwork, abstracts, or summaries contained therein; “**Author**” means the author who is a signatory to this Agreement; “**Collective Work**” means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Materials in their entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole; “**CRC License**” means the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivs 3.0 Unported Agreement, the terms and conditions of which can be found at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>; “**Derivative Work**” means a work based upon the Materials or upon the Materials and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Materials may be recast, transformed, or adapted; “**Institution**” means the institution, listed on the last page of this Agreement, by which the Author was employed at the time of the creation of the Materials; “**JOVE**” means MyJove Corporation, a Massachusetts corporation and the publisher of *The Journal of Visualized Experiments*; “**Materials**” means the Article and / or the Video; “**Parties**” means the Author and JOVE; “**Video**” means any video(s) made by the Author, alone or in conjunction with any other parties, or by JOVE or its affiliates or agents, individually or in collaboration with the Author or any other parties, incorporating all or any portion of the Article, and in which the Author may or may not appear.

2. **Background.** The Author, who is the author of the Article, in order to ensure the dissemination and protection of the Article, desires to have the JOVE publish the Article and create and transmit videos based on the Article. In furtherance of such goals, the Parties desire to memorialize in this Agreement the respective rights of each Party in and to the Article and the Video.

3. **Grant of Rights in Article.** In consideration of JOVE agreeing to publish the Article, the Author hereby grants to JOVE, subject to **Sections 4** and **7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Article in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Article into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Article or other Derivative Works (including, without limitation, the Video) or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Article and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. If the “Open Access” box has been checked in **Item 1** above, JOVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Article as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

4. Retention of Rights in Article. Notwithstanding the exclusive license granted to JoVE in **Section 3** above, the Author shall, with respect to the Article, retain the non-exclusive right to use all or part of the Article for the non-commercial purpose of giving lectures, presentations or teaching classes, and to post a copy of the Article on the Institution's website or the Author's personal website, in each case provided that a link to the Article on the JoVE website is provided and notice of JoVE's copyright in the Article is included. All non-copyright intellectual property rights in and to the Article, such as patent rights, shall remain with the Author.

5. Grant of Rights in Video – Standard Access. This **Section 5** applies if the "Standard Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above or if no box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby acknowledges and agrees that, Subject to **Section 7** below, JoVE is and shall be the sole and exclusive owner of all rights of any nature, including, without limitation, all copyrights, in and to the Video. To the extent that, by law, the Author is deemed, now or at any time in the future, to have any rights of any nature in or to the Video, the Author hereby disclaims all such rights and transfers all such rights to JoVE.

6. Grant of Rights in Video – Open Access. This **Section 6** applies only if the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Section 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Video in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Video into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Video or other Derivative Works or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Video and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. For any Video to which this Section 6 is applicable, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Video as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

7. Government Employees. If the Author is a United States government employee and the Article was prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee, as indicated in **Item 2** above, and any of the licenses or grants granted by the Author hereunder exceed the scope of the 17 U.S.C. 403, then the rights granted hereunder shall be limited to the maximum rights permitted under such

statute. In such case, all provisions contained herein that are not in conflict with such statute shall remain in full force and effect, and all provisions contained herein that do so conflict shall be deemed to be amended so as to provide to JoVE the maximum rights permissible within such statute.

8. Likeness, Privacy, Personality. The Author hereby grants JoVE the right to use the Author's name, voice, likeness, picture, photograph, image, biography and performance in any way, commercial or otherwise, in connection with the Materials and the sale, promotion and distribution thereof. The Author hereby waives any and all rights he or she may have, relating to his or her appearance in the Video or otherwise relating to the Materials, under all applicable privacy, likeness, personality or similar laws.

9. Author Warranties. The Author represents and warrants that the Article is original, that it has not been published, that the copyright interest is owned by the Author (or, if more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, by such authors collectively) and has not been assigned, licensed, or otherwise transferred to any other party. The Author represents and warrants that the author(s) listed at the top of this Agreement are the only authors of the Materials. If more than one author is listed at the top of this Agreement and if any such author has not entered into a separate Article and Video License Agreement with JoVE relating to the Materials, the Author represents and warrants that the Author has been authorized by each of the other such authors to execute this Agreement on his or her behalf and to bind him or her with respect to the terms of this Agreement as if each of them had been a party hereto as an Author. The Author warrants that the use, reproduction, distribution, public or private performance or display, and/or modification of all or any portion of the Materials does not and will not violate, infringe and/or misappropriate the patent, trademark, intellectual property or other rights of any third party. The Author represents and warrants that it has and will continue to comply with all government, institutional and other regulations, including, without limitation all institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy, and all other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, applicable to the Materials, and that all research involving human and animal subjects has been approved by the Author's relevant institutional review board.

10. JoVE Discretion. If the Author requests the assistance of JoVE in producing the Video in the Author's facility, the Author shall ensure that the presence of JoVE employees, agents or independent contractors is in accordance with the relevant regulations of the Author's institution. If more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, JoVE may, in its sole discretion, elect not take any action with respect to the Article until such time as it has received complete, executed Article and Video License Agreements from each such author. JoVE reserves the right, in its absolute and sole discretion and without giving any reason therefore, to accept or decline any work submitted to JoVE. JoVE and its employees, agents and independent contractors shall have

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

full, unfettered access to the facilities of the Author or of the Author's institution as necessary to make the Video, whether actually published or not. JoVE has sole discretion as to the method of making and publishing the Materials, including, without limitation, to all decisions regarding editing, lighting, filming, timing of publication, if any, length, quality, content and the like.

11. **Indemnification.** The Author agrees to indemnify JoVE and/or its successors and assigns from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, arising out of any breach of any warranty or other representations contained herein. The Author further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless JoVE from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, resulting from the breach by the Author of any representation or warranty contained herein or from allegations or instances of violation of intellectual property rights, damage to the Author's or the Author's institution's facilities, fraud, libel, defamation, research, equipment, experiments, property damage, personal injury, violations of institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy or other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, liabilities and other losses or damages related in any way to the submission of work to JoVE, making of videos by JoVE, or publication in JoVE or elsewhere by JoVE. The Author shall be responsible for, and shall hold JoVE harmless from, damages caused by lack of sterilization, lack of cleanliness or by contamination due to the making of a video by JoVE its employees, agents or independent contractors. All sterilization, cleanliness or decontamination procedures shall be solely the responsibility of the Author and shall be undertaken at the Author's

expense. All indemnifications provided herein shall include JoVE's attorney's fees and costs related to said losses or damages. Such indemnification and holding harmless shall include such losses or damages incurred by, or in connection with, acts or omissions of JoVE, its employees, agents or independent contractors.

12. **Fees.** To cover the cost incurred for publication, JoVE must receive payment before production and publication the Materials. Payment is due in 21 days of invoice. Should the Materials not be published due to an editorial or production decision, these funds will be returned to the Author. Withdrawal by the Author of any submitted Materials after final peer review approval will result in a US\$1,200 fee to cover pre-production expenses incurred by JoVE. If payment is not received by the completion of filming, production and publication of the Materials will be suspended until payment is received.

13. **Transfer, Governing Law.** This Agreement may be assigned by JoVE and shall inure to the benefits of any of JoVE's successors and assignees. This Agreement shall be governed and construed by the internal laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts without giving effect to any conflict of law provision thereunder. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall be deemed to me one and the same agreement. A signed copy of this Agreement delivered by facsimile, e-mail or other means of electronic transmission shall be deemed to have the same legal effect as delivery of an original signed copy of this Agreement.

A signed copy of this document must be sent with all new submissions. Only one Agreement required per submission.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Name:

Amanda Yung

Department:

Center for Visual Science

Institution:

University of Rochester

Article Title:

Methods to Test Visual Attention Online

Signature:

Amanda Yung

Date:

6/17/14

Please submit a signed and dated copy of this license by one of the following three methods:

- 1) Upload a scanned copy of the document as a pdf on the JoVE submission site;
- 2) Fax the document to +1.866.381.2236;
- 3) Mail the document to JoVE / Attn: JoVE Editorial / 1 Alewife Center #200 / Cambridge, MA 02139

For questions, please email submissions@jove.com or call +1.617.945.9051

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 (H_0) and alternative (H_1) 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 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.