

Response letter

1. Please, report the final number or the percentage of images that are not excluded.

Response: Among 400 pictures, 272 (68%) pictures were excluded as they were not allocated to the correct picture category by at least 80% of the raters. The final number of selected pictures for trials was 128.

See revision in page 8, 2nd Paragraph.

2. The three different pair of pictures should have an identifier as (a), (b) and (c). Please, use this in order to make a reference to every picture. This is to make more clear which image corresponds to which type.

Response: Figure 2 has been revised and use a, b, c as order to make reference to every picture. See Figure 2.in page 9.

3. Say the number or percentage of invalid data. Always. This is necessary for future researches that read your work.

Response: Each pair had 2 stimulus related trials, there are total 448 trials for one participant, the average invalid trials in IAD group are 13.767 (3.07%), the average invalid trials in HC group are 13.500 (3.01%).

See page 10, last paragraph.

4. In the text, the letter P is written in different formats: P, p or *p*. I suggest to use in the whole text the letter *p*.

Response: This has all been changed to be *p* throughout the manuscript

5. Two comments here.

1. In the header of the table add:

* if $p < 0.05$; ** if $p < 0.01$ and *** if $p < 0.001$. Put this marks in the same column as the numbers. This will make the table much more visual, and also it will follow the standards.

2. In First-fixation duration bias; Disease-threat you have two p-values that are higher than one and also equal to statistical t value. I hope that this was a mistake. Please correct it.

Response: This has been modified and revised.

6. It would be very interesting to see the error bars of each point using the standard deviation of the distribution. Also, I think that this plot is not visual or understandable at all. Please try to do a boxplot instead of this graphic, it would be much more visual and understandable.

Response: Figure 3 has been revised and box plot was used.

See page 12 Figure 3.

7. For Table 3: It would be also interesting to do two different plots. One for each feature.

Response: this has been added as Figure 4a, 4b.

8. I would suggest as well the use of Machine learning classifiers for the study between the two different populations that you are working with.

I think that you have achieved very great results and it will be interesting to see the accuracy that a ML classifier could achieve using the features that you have obtained in this work.

Response: due to the small number of the participants, it is not possible to do machine learning analysis method. The future research will use ML method to improve the model results and to test the accuracy of the model. This is added to the limitation and suggestion for future research section.

See page 18, first paragraph.