**Letter for EIC, Professor Kauffman**

Dear Professor Kauffman,

Thank you for considering our paper suitable for major review. We have tried to meet your expectations and we hope we have done so successfully.

As this is a major revision, this version of the paper includes changes in all sections, but we want to highlight first the most important ones, which are:

* Changes in the conceptual framework, including a greater emphasis on the theoretical foundations a new figure (figure 1) to explain this theoretical framework as well as new and more recent references. These changes imply also changes in the abstract, the introduction and the concluding remarks sections.
* Changes in the explanation of the research design, including more detail specification of possible limitations and a new figure (Figure 2) explaining the definition of the areas of interest and changes in the method section, including more precise definition of the variables in the study.
* Changes in the results section, including a reference to the new heat maps included in Annex 2 and a more detailed description of the modelling process.
* Changes in the concluding results section trying to better reflect our contribution and resulting from the above changes.
* The whole manuscript has been reviewed by a copy-editing firm.

Below we outline how we have addressed each specific comment of the reviewers and the EIC. We also enclose different response letters for reviewers 1, 2 and 3. The original comments are shown in italics.

**Comments from Reviewer 1**

* 1. *My comments are largely addressed in this revision. However there are still grammatical mistakes in the paper and it needs to be carefully proofread. The literature review needs to be broadened and should include modern trends in the area. I suggest to consider including papers such as "Wang, W., Lee, K. & Murray, D. "A global generic architecture for the future Internet of Things," Journal of Service Oriented Computing and Applications (2017),* [*https://doi.org/10.1007/s11761-017-0213-1*](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11761-017-0213-1)*," and a few other similar papers in literature review.*

*\* [EIC's Comments: My assessment is similar to R1's in terms of content. R1 recommended Minor Revisions. The writing is still not of high enough quality for your paper to be immediately publishable in ECRA. My suggestion to you is to engage a professional English language copy editor. For example, if you need Elsevier Service's help, please contact ECRA's Managing Editor, Dr. Kustini Lim-Wavde, who can help to guide you on this. You can also visit ECRA's homepage and look for Elsevier's editing services. Getting this kind of help will enable you to convince me that you've done as much as possible to improve your writing, so the paper is stronger and publishable in terms of its writing.*

**Response for 1.1.** Thank for the suggestion, we have used a professional editing service for this version of the paper. We enclose a certificate of the service firm.

* 1. *Regarding the literature, please make a point to go through the literature in the past 5-8 years to bring in other works (especially from ECRA and IJEC, among other leading IS journals - DSS, JMIS, ISR, MISQ, etc.) that will give you a stronger basis for handling the 'eye-tracking literature. You also may wish to visit the journals from Marketing, where some of these works show up.*

**Response for 1.2.** We have tried to make a comprehensive literature review. As a result, this version of the work includes 28 new references in addition to those already included in the previous version. At the end of this letter we include a complete list of the new references, ordered by appearance in the new version.

* 1. *I also noticed that your Abstract doesn't offer the reader any specific information on the theoretical perspective that you use in this article. Please identify that both in the Abstract and in the paper overall - ideally, that will be in the Intro, the Literature Review, and later when you develop your analysis work and offer comments about your contributions in the Conclusion. R1's comments on future IoTs are appropriate to address as well. I will leave it to the authors to identify the most appropriate journals for this kind of work. Overall, major revisions still are required.]*

We believe that we have done a good job in rewriting the conceptual framework to give greater consistency to the theoretical framework. We started from the two streams of the literature already present in the previous version (the Visual Marketing Attention theory and S-O-R models), to present them in a unified and more systematic way. Our approach is represented in Figure 1. We have also modified the rest of the paper accordingly.

**Comments from Reviewer 2**

* 1. *This version has some modifications. It looks better than before. There still are some minor revisions that should be done. The authors misunderstood the word "failure" in the comments. The real meaning of the comment is as follows: Did the paper find some corresponding patterns to suggest that there is nothing appropriate for their needs, after searching targets, exploring, etc.*

*[EIC's Comments: R2 offers a second vote of Minor Revisions. The person is asking for the author to revisit the comment about the word 'failure.' My impression is that R2 is looking for the author to provide whatever evidence you have collected that would go against your overall findings and arguments. I will make sure that R2 gets a change to read and comment on your next round of adjustments, to see if the changes are acceptable.]*

**Response for 2.1.** We have tried to address the concerns of the reviewer about the failure possibilities. In this version, we have explained in more detail the empirical section and we have also include a paragraph addressing this issue in page 14:

“We do not explicitly measure the success or failure of each task, as the subjects return to the questionnaire when they click anywhere on the screen. However, we measure this dimension implicitly for the four tasks as we ask the participants to rate the attractiveness of the webpage in the first task, to select the chosen model in the second task and to rate how difficult the task has been for them in the case of tasks 3 and 4.”

* 1. *The writing quality should be improved. Some obvious errors are shown, such as 'Table 4A shows the model estimates for transfers from AOI A.' in Page 22.*

*Please also note the concern about the shortcomings in the quality of your written exposition in your article. This is a Major Revisions issue, so the authors will absolutely need to get professional help. I will copy the Managing Editor on the editorial decision that I send to you, so she is aware that I have asked you to reach out for help. It doesn't have to be Elsevier, but the copy editing service you use you use should be professional please.]* **See****Response for 1.1.**

**Comments from Reviewer 3**

*Basically, the authors have followed the comments and modified the paper. Still there are several issues that should be considered though. For example, the imagined experimental environment may lead to random errors. The selected parameters of formulas in Models 1 and 2 are not clarified very well. Further, the authors may add more comparable heat maps like Figure 3, since some web pages for different stages of the purchasing are from real sites.*

*[EIC's comments: R3 has also shared a Minor Revisions request. I noted, however, that the issues this person thinks need to be address still are somewhat different and more technical, and likely to be different from what the author has presented. Regarding R3's comments, I request that the author should do the following:*

*3.1. (a) Re-analyze your experimental set-up, and be more careful and self-critical about what are the possible weaknesses and errors that may arise from its use - you can write about this when you present the experimental design, and also when you consider Limitations of your research in the Conclusion.*

**Response for 3.1.** We have rewritten sections 3.1., 3.2., 3.3 and 3.4. trying to address this issue. We know discuss in more detail the limitations of the sample and the experimental procedure and we have included a new Figure (figure 2) in order to explain the definition of areas of interest.

*3.2. (b) Do additional writing to develop more rigorous arguments about the appropriateness and clarity of your Models 1 and 2. This is a major concern, if you think about it, and you need to get this material in the paper 100% right and easily understood: if readers cannot figure out what you have done, your paper won't be cited very much as representing strong work in the area. This is what we are looking at with ECRA articles that get published in the journal.*

**Response for 3.2.** To facilitate the comprehension of the paper, we have included precise definitions of the variables included in the empirical analysis. Also, we have written a general “modelling process section” in which we discuss the appropriateness ofour modelling approach for all models before introducing the specific formulae for models 1 and 2.

*3.3. Finally, R3's request to add in more heat maps to further showcase the range of results you've obtained in your work seem reasonable to me. You are welcome to include a new 'Heat Map Appendix' at the end of the paper. Explain the contents and their purpose, and what you're illustrating. And include a couple journal pages of visual content to permit readers to learn more about your interesting work.]*

**Response for 3.3.** We also think this is a good idea and we have included and make a reference to the 16 heatmaps and we have also make a more explicit reference to the videos.

**New references (*ordered by appearance in the new version*)**
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**Letter to Reviewer 1**

*My comments are largely addressed in this revision. However there are still grammatical mistakes in the paper and it needs to be carefully proofread. The literature review needs to be broadened and should include modern trends in the area. I suggest to consider including papers such as "Wang, W., Lee, K. & Murray, D. "A global generic architecture for the future Internet of Things," Journal of Service Oriented Computing and Applications (2017),* [*https://doi.org/10.1007/s11761-017-0213-1*](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11761-017-0213-1)*," and a few other similar papers in literature review.*

Thank you for the review. We have tried to address your concerns. We now include the reference you mention and other similar and recent ones.

We have also requested professional assistance in the review of the paper and we hope now the paper will meet your expectations.

As a response from other reviews, we have also strengthened the conceptual framework including a greater emphasis on the theoretical foundations a new figure (figure 1) to explain this theoretical framework as well as new and more recent references. These changes imply also changes in the abstract, the introduction and the concluding remarks sections. We have also included changes in the explanation of the research design, including more detail specification of possible limitations and a new figure (Figure 2) explaining the definition of the areas of interest. In the method section, changes include a more precise definition of the variables in the study. Finally, there are some changes in the results section and in the concluding results section trying to better reflect our contribution and resulting from the above changes.

The complete list of new references (ordered by appearance in the new version) is:
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**Letter to Reviewer 2**

*This version has some modifications. It looks better than before. There still are some minor revisions that should be done. The authors misunderstood the word "failure" in the comments. The real meaning of the comment is as follows: Did the paper find some corresponding patterns to suggest that there is nothing appropriate for their needs, after searching targets, exploring, etc.*

*The writing quality should be improved. Some obvious errors are shown, such as 'Table 4A shows the model estimates for transfers from AOI A.' in Page 22.*

Thank you for the review. We have tried to address your concerns. We are sorry we didn’t address your comments about the failure possibilities in the first revision. In this version, we have explained in more detail the empirical section and we have also include a paragraph addressing this issue in page 14:

“We do not explicitly measure the success or failure of each task, as the subjects return to the questionnaire when they click anywhere on the screen. However, we measure this dimension implicitly for the four tasks as we ask the participants to rate the attractiveness of the webpage in the first task, to select the chosen model in the second task and to rate how difficult how difficult the task has been for them in the case of tasks 3 and 4.”

We have also requested professional assistance in the review of the paper and we hope now the paper will meet your expectations.

As a response from other reviews, we have also strengthened the conceptual framework including a greater emphasis on the theoretical foundations a new figure (figure 1) to explain this theoretical framework as well as new and more recent references. These changes imply also changes in the abstract, the introduction and the concluding remarks sections. We have also included changes in the explanation of the research design, including more detail specification of possible limitations and a new figure (Figure 2) explaining the definition of the areas of interest. In the method section, changes include a more precise definition of the variables in the study. Finally, there are some changes in the results section and in the concluding results section trying to better reflect our contribution and resulting from the above changes.

**Letter to Reviewer 3**

*Basically, the authors have followed the comments and modified the paper. Still there are several issues that should be considered though. For example, the imagined experimental environment may lead to random errors.*

*The selected parameters of formulas in Models 1 and 2 are not clarified very well.*

*Further, the authors may add more comparable heat maps like Figure 3, since some web pages for different stages of the purchasing are from real sites.*

We have rewritten sections 3.1., 3.2., 3.3 and 3.4. trying to address these issues. We know discuss in more detail the limitations of the sample and the experimental procedure and we have included a new Figure (figure 2) in order to explain the definition of areas of interest.

To facilitate the comprehension of the paper, we have included precise definitions of the variables included in the empirical analysis. Also, we have written a general “modelling process section” in which we discuss the appropriateness ofour modelling approach for all models before introducing the specific formulae for models 1 and 2.

We also think that including more heatmaps is a good idea and we have included and make a reference to the 16 heatmaps and we have also make a more explicit reference to the videos.

As a response from other reviews, we have also strengthened the conceptual framework including a greater emphasis on the theoretical foundations a new figure (figure 1) to explain this theoretical framework as well as new and more recent references. These changes imply also changes in the abstract, the introduction and the concluding remarks sections. Finally, there are some changes in the results section and in the concluding results section trying to better reflect our contribution and resulting from the above changes.