Dear Professor Bing Wu,

I really appreciate the detailed comments and the valuable suggestions from the editorial committee and the four reviewers, and thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise my manuscript: “*Using eye movements recorded in the visual world paradigm to explore the online processing of spoken language*” (Manuscript number: 58086). I have thoroughly revised the manuscript to address all the concerns put forward by editorial board. The following paragraphs summarized our responses to the editorial committee and each of the reviewers’ comments.

1. For steps that are done using software (comments 3, 4, and 6), I added a step-wise description of every software usage. To make the description clearer, I split the experimental procedure section in the previous version into two different sections in the current version: Build the experimental script (section 3) and conduct the experiment (section 5). I also redrew Figure 3 to reflect these changes. The protocol now is too long, so I highlighted some steps in yellow to indicate that these steps should be featured in the video.
2. As the editorial board suggested (comments 1, 2), I have removed the personal pronouns and commercial language.
3. I have also explained more explicitly our standard to define “normal or correct normal vision” (comment 5): *As a general guideline, a participant is regarded as eligible as long as the participant can see the test images at a distance of about 60 centimeters* (lines 543-544).

This summarizes how we have responded to the thoughtful comments from the three reviewers and the editorial comments. All the changes, including the ones that are not mentioned in this rebuttal letter, are tracked and highlighted in the revised manuscript. I appreciate the careful readings the editorial board gave to the paper. I have tried to address the comments and criticisms in detail, and I think that this has resulted in a stronger paper.

Kind regards,

Likan Zhan