Hi Björn  
  
looking at your responses to the reviewers now. Sorry it has taken me so long to get to this.  
  
GENERAL

* I think you have done a great job replying to the reviewers. Well done.
* I have reformatted and edited your response letter employing numbers for each response so that you can be more precise than just "see above". And so I can better label my comments below.
* I have made edits (with track changes) directly on the ms.
* self-motion is not one word.
* You can't refer to names in brackets as being part of the sentence they are in! (e.g., 125)
* My computer for some reason jumps line numbers between pages. Thus, pg 2 ends at 138 and pg 3 starts at 188 for me. Where are the missing lines? I have included a pdf here to try and retain these weirdnesses in case your computer does something different. But I notice the pdf is not the same as the docx file either. Weird! I should have restarted on each page. Sorry. Hope you can tell which line I am talking about.
  + Not the case for me?
* i.e., and e.g., are written without spaces and with commas.
* I notice you put a gap between a number and its units: 0.5 s rather than 0.5s and before %: 33 % rather than 33%. This is non-standard, but perhaps the journal wants it that way?
  + <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space_%28punctuation%29>
* My understanding is that it should all be in the past tense. I have corrected some slips I found.
* Referee 2 is a bit of a perceptive old bugger, isn't he?
* I am available to set up a zoom to discuss this:
  + any time over the weekend,
  + at the lab meeting on Monday,
  + Tuesday after 2
  + Wed after 2
  + Friday after 2

VIDEO

* I would swear that some of the little balls are going the other way! Might there be some aliasing going on?
* Should this ALSO have the observer motion in?
* What happened to the back wall?
* What is this video supposed to show anyway? How is it relevant? Oh, it is to show induced motion? For that you would need just the background, no? And I am predicting it would be the OPPOSITE of our hypotheses. But it is easy to get confused with these things.

RESPONSE LETTER

* 1.2 ours is an allocentric judgement, end of story
  + It seems that both of our reviewers are keen on ecological perception, so its probably better to argue why a computational, representational framework makes sense here
* 2.4 Induced motion is when the background moves (e.g., drifting clouds) and makes objects in front of it (e.g., the moon) appear to be moving in the opposite direction. So here, when the person is simulated as moving to the left, the background moves to the right and this could induce ball motion to the left. That is, it might increase its perceived speed if the ball actually were moving to the left (same direction as the simulated motion) or decrease it if it were moving to the right (opposite to the simulated motion). Our hypothesis in this situation is the opposite as we have no reason to think self-motion would be overestimated: namely that self-motion would be underestimated and that when the ball moves in the same direction as the simulated motion its motion would be underestimated because of the cancelling effect of the self motion on its retinal motion and inadequate compensation. Have I got this the right way round? Do you think we even need to mention it in the paper?
  + I have thought it through, and I am pretty much convinced that you are right
* 2.6 Confused: if they saw the whole world moving AND MADE JUDGEMENTS RELATIVE TO THE WORLD they would be completely accurate (well, as accurate as if they were still). Assuming they could solve the geometry. Which they could only do if they knew the motion of the world. So it would be the same, no? I think he is right. If you had a fly in a box heading to one wall and you moved the box around while estimating when the fly would hit the wall it would be the same puzzle we are setting the visual system. (Assume the fly's movement relative to the box was unaffected by the box being moved around). I have written an alternative reply. Let's discuss this on a zoom call.
  + I think the reviewer hasn’t seen the stimulus and thinks that participants might make the velocity judgements relative to themselves?
* 2.8 OF is not retinal. It is optic and not affected by retinal motion (by definition). The FOE is in space, not on the retina. If I am moving (running to catch a moving ball) I do not think I only want to know its velocity relative to me (which will be changing if I run towards it for example), I want to know its physical movement so that I can predict what it is doing in the future. So when I am moving I always need to flow parse. If I am not moving, of course, its moot. Let's discuss.
  + What is OF and FOE?
* 2.10 No, why? The geometry is the same. If vection is experienced you are likely to be better and therefore more accurate. Discuss.
  + See above
* 2.11 what did you add, where?
  + I just added “as a function of depth” where they said they wanted it. Im not one to argue about moot points
* 2.15 I am not convinced by your logic here. It might be better to just say "fixation was maintained at all times".
  + Lets discusZ

REVISED PAPER

* 102 can this really be true? I suppose so in the light of your lit review further down. I have added this to this significance statement as it seems rather significant!
  + What exactly was that?
* 195 relevant to what?
  + What exactly was that?
* 243 I think you need to give the model details of the oculus rift.
* 308 great to have a link to the video: was that there in the original submission? I moved the reference to it to the figure legend.
* Figure 1a suggests the viewer was directly in front of the ball. This is not compatible with lines 249-250 where it says it comes on to the left or right by an unspecified amount. Perhaps a little note in the legend?
  + Yes, good catch
* All the equation numbers are wrong. 3 should be 1 and 1-4 should be 2-5.
* 276 (eq 1) what is 's'? If it means 'seconds' I would replace '0.5s' with 't'.