**Note on the GUI- it may be advisable to check the monitor configuration is set up correctly for your machine. Also, this has been set up so that a second screen can be used to display the GUI.**

**Stimuli/Mixing Notes**

Note that Set 2 is only being used for practice stimuli. The reason for this is that it is best to have reasonably balanced stimuli w.r.t emotions. Set 2 pieces are intended to be sad (negative valence, low arousal, low dominance). Amongst the other 18 pieces we already have 9 negative-valence pieces, three of which are 'sad'. We could have used Set 6 (also sad) as the test stimuli instead.

**Chords and Keys:**

Sebastian and Daksh used major and minor keys to control emotion; I believe that Set 1 and set 2 are the same chord progression, but with major keys used for the latter, and minor keys used for the former (same for sets 3 and 4).

For George M’s pieces (based on the keyb/vibr ones Sebastian had already created): “I used a combination of major and minor tuned harmonicas and even multiple harmonicas per example.”

**Mixing/normalisation:**

BEFORE calibration is run:

Pieces set to 30s exactly, then set from stereo to mono. Then, RMS loudness set to -25dB.

Process: 30s, mono, normalised to -25dB (norm verified), 0.6s fade in and 0.6s fade out

-23.25 dB for Set07-Harm and THINK -23.25dB for Set07-Keyb (-23.2 for both?)

E-Z patch applied over a click in Set02-Harm

Reason for mixing down to mono:

-In part 2, the participant will hear each stream in mono form. We want to compare the results across parts (e.g, comparing part 1 and part 2 results), so it makes sense to use mono consistently for comparability. This might be especially important with earEEG (subtle-ish differences in what is heard and perceived between the two sides may matter).

Reasons for RMS normalization (even though we later run personal calibration tests):

1. Having things normalised/part-way there just makes it easier for the participant.
2. Certain files, even for the same instruments, louder than others depending on how artists recorded and so on. Hence, want to normalise “within instruments”.
3. The weighting system used works linearly- this doesn’t work as well for dealing with human perception (particularly considering the different instruments). So it’s good to normalise by RMS beforehand for this reason.

**NOTE ON SET07:**

-Conducted tests where people completed parts of the calibration (finding their centre correctly for each instrument), and then listened to:

Set01-Vibr, Set01-Harm, Set01-Keyb (or Set04 counterparts). They would adjust linear loudness until it was set correctly.

They would then listen to the Set07 versions and do the same.

3 people (inc me) listened to Set04 ones, two others listened to Set01 ones. I was the only one who had heard the pieces prior (one of them may have heard Set07 ones months ago).

Note- set07 ones may have already had slightly different dB loudnesses to each other/others. Also note that for this test, participants hear fully-processed versions (including fade-ins!) for first 10s.

Also note that due to minor differences (e.g, associated with Audacity rounding, fade-ins), there were slight differences in loudness for the set01/set04 comparison pieces (all were about -25dB +/- 0.27dB RMS). Accounted for this by doing weighted averages/sums in the calculations.

Converting between linear results to RMS power values, and also extrapolating (as we only used the first 10s of each piece in the listening tests), decided to set the Set07 pieces as follows; RMS, after fade-in/out applied:

Vibr: -23.75dB Harm: -20.94dB Keyb: -23.68dB