

Thank you very much for your helpful comments on the paper. We have made all of the edits asked for. We would hope that these changes have increase the readability of the paper.

Editor Comments:

1. Your manuscript can benefit significantly from adding at least two figures (method section) and an additional table (result section). This was also pointed out by the reviewers. Please add a figure showing ice thickness forecasts in seven different types. This should help readers visualize the different graph types you use with your research participants. The second figure that would be useful is a photo (or cartoon drawing) of the eye tracking device together with a screenshot of what participants look at and how the eye tracking appears on the screen. Please note that including a link to the device website does not suffice as links can change or be removed over time. It also keeps the reader on the manuscript page instead of sending them to another page.

Response:

Added a figure showing graph type examples as Figure 1.

Added a figure (Figure 2) showing pictures of the eye-tracker from two angles including one in which a trial is shown on the display used in the experiment. We have also included a map showing the concentration of fixations on four example trials, known as heat maps. It should be noted that no eye-tracking is shown to the participants as they examine the graphs. They do not see an indication on the display showing them where their gaze lies.

2. Sections 3.1 - 3.3 (results) are difficult to follow. Please list all the stats in a table that you can refer to in the text. This was also mentioned by the reviewers. Consider including an image of each graph in this table to help the readers identify quickly what data go with what graph type/area, and provide a caption that explains all the terminologies, and abbreviations you use in the table and text (e.g., F, MSE, etc.). Not all GC readers are familiar with these terms.

Response: To ease this difficulty we have added two tables (Table 1 and 2) summarizing the statistical outcomes for sections 3.1 and 3.2 to the results section and pointed to them in the text in the first paragraph of each section. We would hope the addition of Figure 1 showing graph types will help readers successfully link up the results with each graph type. We have also provided a key to the analysis of variance outcomes at the end of the method section in the Data Analysis subsection.

3. Please explain your stat work (mixed measure ANOVA - four-way vs. one-way) in the methods section and explain why this approach was chosen. Not every reader is familiar with this method. Also, consider moving line 294-296 to the methods section.

Response: we have moved text from the beginning of the results section into the data analysis section (as suggested) and added to this with more detail about the ANOVA design and why this approach was adopted. We have also added a reference to this should the reader want to explore the analysis of variance any further.

4. You have measured fixation frequency and duration. How about eye blinking and other types of eye movements that may be important to consider in the interpretation of your

results. Are these measurable, and if so, will they be relevant to the conclusions of this study?

Response: The eye-tracking we carry out does return many other measures such as eye blinks, pupil size, saccade direction, its duration and velocity among many others. Some of these would be illuminating when it comes to examining how people look at graphical information over time in order to support their decision making. However, the measures we report are general measures that give a very good overview of gaze behaviour and information seeking when faced with these types of graphs. Other measures would be interesting to examine in other experiments, for example, when the physical layout of each graph type was directly manipulated in an organised way, such as manipulating the location of the key, but that was not the case here.

Eye blinks themselves might not necessarily be interesting here as they are commonly taken as a measure of anxiety and emotional reaction, which was not the focus of this study, but they may possibly reflect task difficulty which could be of interest when faced with unusual graphs and required to make decisions. Thank you very much for the suggestion we will careful consider this for our future work.