**Title: “Attention to Online Channels across the Path to Purchase: An Eye-Tracking Study   
Electronic Commerce Research and Applications”**

We thank the editors for giving us the chance to revise and resubmit our manuscript. We also thank the editor and the three expert reviewers for their comments. We have responded to the comments below. Our responses are in standard font while editor/reviewer comments are in bold. We have revised our manuscript in accordance with editor’s/reviewer’s comments. The changes we have made in our manuscript are highlighted in red text.

**Dear Professor Monica Cortinas,**  
**The reviews on your above paper have been received. They indicate that it is not acceptable for publication in its present form.   
  
However, if you feel that you can suitably address the review comments (included below), I invite you to revise and resubmit your manuscript.   
  
Please carefully address the issues raised in the comments.   
  
If you are submitting a revised manuscript, please also:   
  
a) outline each change made (point by point) as raised in the review comments   
  
AND/OR   
  
b) provide a suitable rebuttal to each review comment not addressed   
  
  
I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. I would very much appreciate if you would submit it by Feb 24, 2019.**  
  
**When submitting your revised manuscript, please ensure that you upload the source files (e.g. Word). Uploading a PDF file at this stage will create delays should your manuscript be finally accepted for publication. If your revised submission does not include the source files, we will contact you to request them.   
  
We encourage you to share data that supports your research publication where appropriate. Click here for more details: https://www.elsevier.com/authors/author-services/research-data   
  
I kindly request you to notify the ECRA Editorial Office, if you decide not to resubmit your paper to ECRA or if you wish to submit your work to another journal, by clicking the link 'Decline to revise'.   
  
Yours sincerely,   
  
Robert J. Kauffman   
Editor-in-Chief   
Electronic Commerce Research and Applications**  
  
We sincerely thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our paper.

Many thanks to you and the two reviewers for your careful reading of our paper and your constructive comments.

**Reviewers' comments:**  
**Reviewer 1:** This paper focusing on using eye tracking technique for observing customer behaviour thought various stages of purchase process. Although eye tracking and questionnaire is used to support suggested propositions and statistical analysis of eye tracking is presented. However questionnaire and eye tracking results are presented in isolation. These two information need to complement to in order to shed the light on presented propositions.   
Following issues need to addressed

* **How amalgamation of eye gaze data and questionnaire result support the prepositions presented in the paper**
* **Provide a clear relation to existing work and also highlight contribution and novelty of the paper. In in current form it's hard to see novelty in relation to extant work. As in its current form the statistical analysis does not provide credible insight into the problem and its solution.**
* **Figure 2 is not clear**
* **Appendix 2 got spellings mistakes please correct them**

Dear reviewer, thank you for your time and valuable feedback. We have tried in this revised version to address your concerns and hope that our efforts are satisfactory. More specifically, with respect to the points you raise:

- **How amalgamation of eye gaze data and questionnaire result support the prepositions presented in the paper.**

We have clarified our explanation of the empirical models. In our paper, the amalgamation of the eye tracking data and feedback from the questionnaire is achieved by combining the data from both sources in the estimation of the empirical models. Thus, the dependent variable in all the models is drawn from the eye-tracking experiment (time-spent on task, fixations per area and transfers between areas) and the independent variables are drawn from the questionnaire. We think this has been made clearer in the new version. Section 4, headed Research Design, has changed both in structure and content.

**- Provide a clear relation to existing work and also highlight contribution and novelty of the paper. In in current form it's hard to see novelty in relation to extant work. As in its current form the statistical analysis does not provide credible insight into the problem and its solution.**

The Introduction, conceptual framework, and conclusions have all been modified in order to address this concern. We believe that the paper has improved in this respect.

**- Figure 2 is not clear**

Figure 2 has been explained more fully.

**- Appendix 2 got spellings mistakes please correct them**

These have been corrected. Thank you for pointing them out.

**Reviewer2:**

* **The Introduction section should better be concise and make your problem important and highlight your contribution. The organization of this section should be rearranged, such as the research problems is given at the almost end of this section   
  It is difficult for readers to understand that the writing style that each topic corresponding to the paper's research arose a specific related works.**

We have rewritten the Introduction, conceptual framework and conclusion in order to address this concern. We believe that the paper has improved in this respect.

* **There is an error of numbering issues in Section 4.**
* This has been corrected. Thank you for pointing it out.
* **What's the preference order of the four proposed propositions?**

Section 3, headed Conceptual Framework, where the propositions are presented, has been changed slightly. We have introduced the role of category involvement in attention processes, clarified the wording of proposition 1, and removed the explanation of eye tracking to Section 4, headed Research Design.

With respect to the order of the propositions, time is mentioned before areas of interest, but the order is not based on preference.

* **The task of exploration is not clear. Whether did I mean to explore both new products and the information of the specific product? If not, what's the difference of user's patterns between the two tasks? Furthermore, maybe, a set of fine-grained tasks should be designed, and corresponding experiments and their results may be more interesting.**

We hope that this has become clearer in the new structure and wording. Section 4, headed Research Design is now subdivided into subsections for different aspects of the experiment: subjects and design; materials: web stores; materials: tasks, procedure; and method.

* **Did the simulated system allow the failure of purchasing behavior?**

One of the specifications of the system was that the store closed once the users behaviour had been recorded. We hope this has become clearer after restructuring Section 4, headed Research Design.

**Reviewer 3:** It looks interesting that this work observed how customer perceptions of digital channels vary across different four purchasing tasks through eye-tracking techniques. Experiments were developed with the four purchasing tasks and four different product categories. The discussions are reasonable.

* **The paper will benefit if more related and comparable work could be provided, which may improve supporting evidences for its advancement.**

We have rewritten the Introduction, conceptual framework and conclusion in order to address this concern. We believe that the paper has improved in this respect.

* **The authors discussed the indicators and developed the work based on imagined purchasing scenarios. Obviously it will be better to do this work based on real purchasing environments, especially for customer perceptions.**

We agree with the reviewer on this point. However, we aimed for maximum realism by ensuring that the simulated web stores for different product categories had a natural-looking e-commerce website layout.

* **Also the experiment subjects are not convincing. The 58 students were at similar age, major, degree and status.**

After selecting the research setting, we decided for various reasons to restrict the target population to university students. 25 to 34 year-olds make up the second largest segment (20.6%) of online purchasers in Spain in 2017, while the higher education population accounts for 34.3% (Ontsi, 2017). The product categories selected for the experimental tasks (sport shoes, mobile phone, ball-point pens, hard disks) are popular online purchases among university students. A further circumstance is that previous studies have used the eye-tracking method to collect attention and fixation data during website tasks also used students as their subjects (Shi, Wedel and Pieters, 2013; Djasmasbi, Siegel and Tullis, 2010; Reutskaja, Nagel, Camerer and Rangel, 2011; Velásquez, 2013; Wang, et al., 2014; Leuthold et al., 2011) no although this is not the case in ad attention studies, where randomly-selected consumer samples are used (Pieters and Wedel, 2004; Wedel and Pieters, 2000).

These reasons led us to consider university students as a suitable population for the study.

* **Besides, noise data should be considered, to improve the reliability of experiment result.**

Eye data are analysed in order to detect fixations and noisy gaze values, simultaneously. Raw data provided by the eye tracker are processed to calculate fixations. Spatial dispersion criteria are used. In this manner, a fixation should be a quasi-stable angular position of the eye (movements below 1º) during a dwell time (standard value 200 ms). This procedure contributes on the one hand to detect fixations and on the other hand to filter out noisy data. According to the manufacturer an accuracy of 0.5º and 0.1ºrms is to be expected. Therefore our threshold of 1º works nicely for the tracker. Moreover, since only data in the AOIs is considered any outlier value out of the AOIs is filtered out and does not affect the results.

The paper has been modified in order to emphasize the fixation estimation algorithm and its relation with the noise. We consider that the paper is now clearer in explaining how the noise is handled (see Method in Section 4. Research design).

* **Some of sub-titles look confusing to the reviewer.**  
    
  This has been corrected. Thank you for pointing it out.