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Abstract

Purpose: This study presents a 2° customized animated stimulus developed to evaluate smooth pursuit in children and investigates the effect of its predetermined characteristics (stimulus type and size) in an adult population. Then, the animated stimulus is used to evaluate the impact of different pursuit motion paradigms in children.

Methods: To study the effect of animating a stimulus, eye movement recordings were obtained from 20 young adults while the customised animated stimulus and a standard dot stimulus were presented moving horizontally at a constant velocity. In order to study the effect of using a larger stimulus size, eye movement recordings were obtained from 10 young adults while presenting a standard dot stimulus of different size (1° and 2°) moving horizontally at a constant velocity. Finally, eye movement recordings were obtained from 12 children while the 2° customized animated stimulus was presented following three different smooth pursuit motion paradigms. Performance parameters, including gains and number of saccades, were calculated for each stimulus condition.

Results: The animated stimulus produced in young adults significantly higher velocity gain (mean: 0.93; 95% CI: 0.90-0.96; p=0.014), position gain (0.93; 0.85-1; p=0.025), proportion of smooth pursuit (0.94; 0.91-0.96, p=0.002) and fewer saccades (5.30; 3.64-6.96, p=0.008) than a standard dot (velocity gain: 0.87; 0.82-0.92; position gain: 0.82; 0.72-0.92; proportion smooth pursuit: 0.872; 0.83-0.90; number of saccades: 7.75; 5.30-10.46). In contrast, changing the size of a standard dot stimulus from 1° to 2° did not have an effect on smooth pursuit in young adults (p>0.05). Finally, smooth pursuit performance did not significantly differ in children for the different motion paradigms when using the animated stimulus (p>0.05).
Conclusions: Attention-grabbing and more dynamic stimuli, such the developed animated stimulus might potentially be useful for eye movement research. Finally, with such stimuli, children perform equally well irrespective of the motion paradigm used.
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Exploration of the space around us ideally requires not only normal visual acuity but also the absence of any ocular pathology, including normal eye movements. In order to stabilise the retinal image, there are different types of eye movements that suit different types of objects, motions and conditions. For instance, smooth pursuit involves conjugate eye movements responsible for smooth, accurate tracking of a slow moving object in order to maintain its image on the foveas, whereas saccades are the eye movements responsible for shifts of gaze that bring the image of a peripherally placed object of interest into the foveal region.

Saccades and smooth pursuit eye movements have been traditionally studied using dots and light spots in both adults and children. In contrast, different stimuli, such as cartoon characters or faces, have been designed to study eye movements in infants. The wider variety of stimuli used for eye movement research in infants are intended to maintain infant’s attention, the main reason being that there might be a relationship between attention and eye movements, such that higher attention engagement might improve eye movement performance. Interestingly, such approaches aimed at increasing/maintaining attention in infants have not been adopted as a standard for eye movement research, even though recent evidence has shown that the stimulus type and its features also have an impact on eye movement performance in non-infant populations. For example, Irving et al. (2011) reported significantly higher saccadic peak velocities, shorter saccadic latencies, and more accurate saccades when using cartoon pictures as stimuli than when using standard dots. The difference in performance between the stimuli was evident and statistically significant in young children but decreased up to the age of 8-9 years, while in adults the differences were negligible. Similar results were found by the same authors for smooth pursuit eye movements. For instance, in children the use of animal pictures as smooth pursuit
targets resulted in significantly higher gains compared to standard dots. Although higher gains using cartoons were also observed in adults, the difference in performance between stimuli was not significant. These results support the idea that eye movements can be assessed more successfully using more interesting and meaningful targets and heighten the need for more appropriate stimuli to investigate oculomotor control, especially in young populations.

Moreover, there is currently no standardised stimulus motion to study smooth pursuit eye movements, resulting in three main motion paradigms having been used in pursuit studies: the ramp, the step-ramp, and the sinusoidal. The ramp is probably the simplest approach, using a target that starts moving suddenly at a constant velocity for a certain period of time. At the onset of the target movement, the smooth pursuit performance is poor and often begins with an initial saccade, but then there is a notable increase in eye velocity that leads to an improvement in the smooth pursuit response. To avoid or minimize the effect of this initial saccade, some authors have modified the stimulus motion and developed what is known as the step-ramp paradigm. In this approach, the fixation target suddenly moves (step) prior to the constant velocity (ramp) movement of the target, in order to ‘alert’ the subject to the onset of motion. Eye movements can also be studied in response to a stimulus for which velocity continuously changes in a sinusoidal manner. While multiple studies evaluating the effect of age on smooth pursuit in adults have used stimuli moving at constant velocity, studies in children and infants have used not only different constant velocity motions but also sinusoidal motion paradigms. Moreover, the literature suggests that there is an issue with the choice of smooth pursuit motion paradigm in infant and child populations, which does not persist in adult populations. For instance, an early study suggested that the step-ramp should be used in young infants to increase their
attention.\textsuperscript{20} The rationale discussed by the author was that the saccade prior to the movement of the target may be more effective in increasing infants’ awareness and attention than other stimulus motions. In contrast, sinusoidal motions have been described as a better option for school age children.\textsuperscript{6,20} Interestingly, we are not aware of any published study assessing smooth pursuit differences in young populations between these motion paradigms.

This study aimed to evaluate any possible advantage of using an animated stimulus developed for eye movement studies in children and investigate the effect of the predetermined characteristics of such stimulus (type and size) in young adults. Finally, this animated stimulus was used in a study of pursuit in a small group of children to investigate the effect of motion paradigm on smooth pursuit performance in young populations.

\textbf{Materials and Methods}

\textbf{Participants}

Twenty young adults (mean age 24 ± SD 1.42; range: 21 to 27) predominantly males (13/20) were recruited for experiment 1, and ten young adults (mean age of 21.50 ± SD 2.12; range: 20 to 25) with no difference in gender distribution (5/10) were recruited for experiment 2. Twelve child participants (mean age 6.33 ± SD 3.31; range 3 to 14), predominantly males (7/12) were recruited for experiment 3. The adult subjects were students and staff at the School of Optometry and Vision Sciences at Cardiff University, and the child subjects were recruited through local advertising.

All three experiments received ethical approval from the Cardiff University School of Optometry and Vision Sciences Research and Audit Ethics Committee, and procedures were in accordance with the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki. Written consent
forms were obtained from the young adult participants and consent forms were received from both the children and their parents or legal guardians. All participants were screened to confirm visual acuity of at least logMAR 0.1 and the absence of strabismus. The tests comprised near and distance visual acuity with current prescription, if any, and eye alignment by cover test. The visual acuity criteria were set to include participants with low uncorrected refractive errors, mainly myopia.

Visual stimulus and setup

The newly developed animated stimulus comprised an animal cartoon image that moved horizontally, while continuously changing shape and colour as it morphed into different animals (Figure 1 and Video 1, Supplemental Digital Content 1, Video that shows the eye movement recording of a 4 year old child using our customised setup and animated stimulus). The perception of a more complex image such as a face, can be influenced by the size of that image, such that larger angular size may improve recognition and performance, especially in young populations. In addition, eye movements such as saccades are not dependent on stimulus size up to sizes of 3-5°. For these reasons, the size chosen for the customised animated stimulus was 2°, in order to maximise attention and to ensure that the size of the stimuli was the minimum necessary to allow the discrimination of the animal cartoon features.

The animal’s eyes and a small dot situated in the centre of the cartoon were maintained constant in order to provide a fixation point throughout the test.

The unchanging visual stimulus, referred to as a “standard dot” was a black filled circle containing a small white dot in the centre, which provided a fixation point. This standard visual stimulus was consistent with that used in previous studies. Both visual stimuli were displayed on a computer monitor on a white background.
**Procedure and eye movement recordings**

*Eye Tracker*

Simultaneous eye movement recordings were performed using the Tobii TX300 (Tobii Technology, Stockholm, Sweden) eye tracker. The system comprises an eye tracker unit and a removable 23” widescreen monitor with 1920x1080 pixel resolution and an integrated webcam. This remote eye tracker uses the different Purkinje reflections of the eye to establish the horizontal and vertical position of both eyes at a sample rate of 300Hz, and with a maximum gaze angle of ±35°. The system gaze accuracy given by the manufacturer is ±0.5° for monocular and ±0.4° for binocular conditions.

The participants’ eye movements were recorded using Tobii Studio™ (Tobii Technology, Stockholm, Sweden) while displaying the stimuli on the monitor situated immediately above the eye tracker unit. Participants’ performance and behaviour were recorded and also monitored live via the widescreen monitor integrated webcam.

*Calibration*

The position and height of the participant’s chair and/or the eye tracker desk were adjusted to ensure that the subject’s eyes were positioned 65cm away from the eye tracker and in front of the geometrical centre of the screen monitor. Prior to eye movement recording, the eye tracker was successfully calibrated for each participant at 5 target positions on the monitor using the standard Tobii five point calibration. All stimuli presented later were contained within the calibrated area.

*Experiment 1: Effect of stimulus type on smooth pursuit performance in young adults*

The customised animated stimulus (Figure 1 and Video 1, Supplemental Digital Content 1) moved horizontally following a 6°/sec ramp paradigm. The stimulus appeared for one second at 10° to the left of the participant’s straight ahead position.
After this initial fixation period, the stimulus moved horizontally (left to right) following a constant velocity motion (6°/sec) that lasted 3.33 seconds. The stimulus stopped when it was at 10° to the right of the participant’s straight ahead position (Figure 2). Fixation periods were presented for two seconds between each ramp (left to right or right to left) before the stimulus moved again to the left or to the right. A total of four smooth pursuit ramps were presented, so that the stimulus moved left to right and right to left twice. The stimulus presentation lasted for 22.33 seconds. Then, the stimulus was changed to a standard dot subtending 1° and measures were repeated following the same motion paradigm and velocity. The authors chose to present the animated stimulus first so that the participants did not have previous experience with the smooth pursuit task, and therefore any learning effects were avoided when presenting this stimulus.

Experiment 2: Effect of stimulus size on smooth pursuit performance in young adults

In order to evaluate the effect of using a larger stimulus size on smooth pursuit performance, a standard dot stimulus was presented in two different sizes: subtending 1° and 2° of visual angle. The presentation order of the two stimuli was alternated between participants. The stimuli followed the same motion and velocity as experiment 1.

Experiment 3: Effect of stimulus motion paradigm on smooth pursuit performance in children

In this last experiment, the 2° customised animated stimulus was presented to study eye movements in a small group of children.

Because children are more likely to move during the eye movement recording than adults, a customised child-friendly head stabiliser was developed. This consisted of an
articulated arm with a forehead rest attached to the end (Figure 3). The forehead rest featured an adjustable plastic toy crown. The head stabiliser allowed participants to make slight head movements laterally and maintained their head at the optimal distance of 65cm from the monitor and eye tracker throughout the test. This customised head stabiliser naturally encouraged child participants to keep a steady position as large movements resulted in the crown falling off their head (Video 1, Supplemental Digital Content 1). This customised head stabiliser was aimed at maintaining the participants’ distance from the eye tracker, and therefore maintaining the relative velocity of the smooth pursuit stimulus constant throughout the experiments and across subjects.

The same calibration and recording procedures were followed, but two additional motion paradigms were also presented using the animated stimulus. After the standard five point calibration was performed, the stimulus was presented following three different motion paradigms in the same order: a 6º/sec ramp, a 6º/sec step-ramp and a sinusoidal motion paradigm (peak velocity 6º/sec). The ramp motion paradigm, presented was identical to that used in experiments 1 and 2. In the step-ramp paradigm, the stimulus initially appeared at its starting position for one second, and then the stimulus was displaced 1º horizontally where it remained for another second before returning to the previous position to start the constant velocity ramp at 6º/sec. The target displacement (step) was repeated before the next ramp started. This smooth pursuit task lasted 23.33 seconds. For the sinusoidal motion, the fixation periods between ramps were deleted and the velocity of the stimulus changed continuously following a sinusoidal waveform. The duration for that task was 14.33 seconds. The complete experiment lasted 60 seconds.

Table 1 summarizes the number of participants taking part and the stimulus type, size, and motion presented in each of the three experiments carried out.
**Data analysis**

Eye position traces were analysed offline using custom software written in MATLAB (The Mathworks, Inc., Natick, MA, USA). Eye velocity was obtained by differentiation of the eye position over time and smoothed with a 3-sample window moving average filter, to reduce the additional noise arising from the differentiation process.²⁶

Saccades were automatically detected with the adaptive threshold algorithm described in detail by Behrens et al. (2010). Briefly, this algorithm determines acceleration thresholds based on the standard deviation of the distribution of 200 preceding acceleration data values. Saccades are defined and detected as those data points that exceeded the established threshold. Saccade amplitudes were calculated, and saccades below 1º amplitude were classified as microsaccades.²⁷, ²⁸

Periods of smooth pursuit that were free of saccades were plotted and further analysed. Some authors exclude periods of possible slowed smooth pursuit from their analysis.²⁹, ³⁰ In contrast, other authors include all smooth pursuit segments, suggesting this may offer a better measurement of global smooth pursuit function.³¹, ³² In any case, the difference in gain scores between these two measures has been reported to be less than 2% with a greater than 0.95 correlation.³² In this study, we included all smooth pursuit segments, and the position gain for a given interval of smooth pursuit was defined as the ratio between the eye position and the target position for this interval. The position gains obtained from all smooth pursuit segments were averaged to obtain the mean position gain for each participant.

To obtain eye velocity for the constant velocity motions, a linear regression was performed on each segment of smooth pursuit data, and the slope of the fitted equation was defined as the eye velocity for that segment. The velocity of each segment was then
weighted for the duration of the segment, then velocities were averaged together to obtain the mean time-weighted velocity for that smooth pursuit task and participant. Finally, velocity gain was calculated by dividing the time-weighted mean eye velocity by the stimulus velocity. For the sinusoidal motion paradigm, a polynomial fitting was performed along the eye position data without the saccades, and the velocity gain was defined as the coefficient of determination, \( R^2 \), between the smooth pursuit data and the polynomial fit.

The total proportion of smooth pursuit was defined as the total eye movement involving slow phase (i.e without saccades) divided by the total stimulus movement (20º for each smooth pursuit ramp).

**Statistical analysis**

The IBM SPSS software package version 18.0 (IBM SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA) was used for statistical analysis. Normality tests were first performed on the data, including histograms and Shapiro-Wilk tests. In experiment 1, all parameters except the mean amplitude of the saccades \((p<0.001)\) and the number of microsaccades \((p<0.001)\) were normally distributed, while in experiment 2, only velocity gain appeared not to be normally distributed \((p=0.004)\). Hence, parametric t-tests and non-parametric Wilcoxon test were used accordingly.

In experiment 3, only the number of microsaccades was not normally distributed. Parametric repeated measures ANOVA was still used to statistically analyse all the parameters in experiment 3, including the number of microsaccades, as ANOVA has been suggested to be robust to even moderate deviations from normality.\(^{33, 34}\)

For statistical purposes, a \( p \) value lower than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant in all three experiments.
Results

Experiment 1: Effect of stimulus type on smooth pursuit performance in young adults

Figures 4 and 5 show the smooth pursuit performance parameters obtained with the animated and the standard dot stimuli in each participant. The average smooth pursuit performance parameters for the animated and the dot stimuli are summarised in Table 2. The animated stimulus produced, on average, higher velocity gains and position gain, as well as a higher total proportion of smooth pursuit than the standard dot. These were significantly different from velocity gain (t=2.702; p=0.014), position gain (t=1.441; p=0.025) and the proportion of smooth pursuit (t=3.544; p=0.002) obtained with the standard dot stimuli. Additionally, fewer saccades were produced during smooth pursuit with the animated than with the standard dot stimulus (t=-2.957; p=0.008). In contrast, Wilcoxon tests revealed that stimulus type had no effect on the mean amplitude of the saccades (Z=-0.342; p=0.732) or the number of microsaccades (Z=-1.009; p=0.313).

Experiment 2: Effect of stimulus size on smooth pursuit performance in young adults

One participant recruited had an alternating strabismus, and data for this participant were excluded from the analysis. Figures 6 and 7 show the smooth pursuit performance parameters obtained from the nine participants. The average smooth pursuit performance parameters for the 1° and 2° standard dots are summarised in Table 3. Velocity and position gains as well as the proportion of smooth pursuit have similar values with each of the two stimuli sizes presented. A Wilcoxon test showed no differences in velocity gain (Z=-1.357; p=0.176), and paired t-tests did not reveal any
significant differences in position gain ($t=-0.223; p=0.829$) or the proportion of smooth pursuit ($t=-1.029; p=0.334$) between the 1º and 2º standard dots.

Although the 1º standard dot produced on average fewer saccades and microsaccades than the 2º standard dot, neither difference was significant (number of saccades: $t=1.397; p=0.211$; number of microsaccades: $t=0.185; p=0.858$). Moreover, parametric paired t-tests revealed no significant differences in the mean amplitude of the saccades ($t=-0.545; p=0.605$) between the two stimuli sizes.

Experiment 3: Effect of stimulus motion paradigm on smooth pursuit performance in children

Figures 8 and 9 show the smooth pursuit performance parameters obtained in each participant following three different motion paradigms. Repeated measures ANOVA with a Greenhouse-Geisser correction for sphericity confirmed that velocity gain ($F=1.689; p=0.222$), position gain ($F=1.479; p=0.243$), and proportion of smooth pursuit ($F=3.213; p=0.062$) were not significantly different between the ramp, the step-ramp and the sinusoidal motion paradigms. Similarly, repeated measures ANOVA showed that the number of saccades ($F=1.420; p=0.265$), the mean amplitude of the saccades ($F=1.137; p=0.341$) and the number of microsaccades ($F=2.824; p=0.083$) were not significantly different between motion paradigms.

Discussion

Different stimuli can be used to study eye movements, but it is reasonable to suggest that changes in some of their characteristics may affect subjects’ overall performance. A recent study has demonstrated that smooth pursuit and saccadic dynamics can be improved using cartoon-based stimuli. Such improvement can be attributed to the fact that more meaningful targets increase attention and therefore impact on oculomotor
performance. If this view is correct, the next logical step to further enhance attention would be to use not only more interesting but also more dynamic stimuli. While this can perhaps be more easily achieved for saccadic eye movements by using series of cartoon characters appearing at different locations, more complex and different stimuli might be needed to maintain attention during smooth pursuit eye movements. Hence, the first experiment investigated in young adults whether or not more complex and dynamic stimuli might be a better option to evaluate smooth pursuit eye movements than the traditional and static stimuli (e.g. dots, cartoons, light spots). The results revealed that smooth pursuit performance in a young adult population was significantly improved when using a customised animated stimulus if compared to a standard dot stimulus. For instance, smooth pursuit gains were found to be significantly higher and the number of saccades was found to be significantly lower when using the animated stimulus if compared to a standard dot in a young adult population. Although these results seem to contradict previous findings, which suggested that stimuli characteristics have little effect on smooth pursuit performance in adults, our stimulus is qualitatively different from any stimuli used in previous eye movement research. For instance, the two stimuli compared by Irving et al. (2011) were similar in that they were “unchanging stimuli”, while the continuously changing (animated) stimulus presented here was designed to increase/maintain attention. Hence, our results suggest that using a dynamic stimulus could improve oculomotor performance in an adult population, and further studies using such stimuli are warranted.

In the first experiment, which aimed to investigate the effect of stimulus type on smooth pursuit performance, the presentation order of the stimuli was not alternated. Thus, the animated stimulus was always presented first followed by the unchanging dot stimulus. It could be argued that this design is not ideal, as maintaining the same presentation
order in each participant could have affected the smooth pursuit performance for each
stimulus type. However, the authors chose to always present the animated stimulus first
so that the participants did not have previous experience with the smooth pursuit task,
and therefore any learning effects were avoided when presenting this stimulus. Hence,
if learning effects were present due to the repetition of the smooth pursuit task following
the same motion and velocity, these would have appeared when presenting the
unchanging dot stimulus, resulting in evidence for an improved performance.

It has been suggested that the size of the stimulus is also important when evaluating eye
movements, so that large stimuli may elicit an optokinetic response rather than a
voluntary smooth pursuit\textsuperscript{25} or saccades might become less accurate.\textsuperscript{22, 23} Hence, the
second experiment was designed to evaluate the effect of stimulus size on smooth
pursuit performance. The results showed no significant differences in any of the smooth
pursuit parameters between a 1º and 2º standard dot following a ramp motion paradigm.
These findings agree with previously published results, which suggest that smooth
pursuit performance is independent of stimulus size, unless very large stimuli sizes are
used.\textsuperscript{13} Additionally, the smooth pursuit gains obtained for the standard dot stimuli
reported here are similar to those reported in the literature for adults using dots or
similar static stimuli at comparable velocities,\textsuperscript{13, 36, 37} and confirm that our young adult
population was not different from previously studied samples. One could argue that
smooth pursuit performance using the dot stimuli was better in experiment 2 than in
experiment 1 and that, therefore, some inconsistencies might be present. However, it is
important to note that two different adult samples of different size (n=20 vs n=10)
participated in each study, and therefore the results from both experiments should be
compared carefully. In any case, there were no statistically significant differences
between the results obtained using the 1º standard dot in experiments 1 and 2. In
addition, the results from experiment 2 are in agreement with previous literature\textsuperscript{22, 23} and further support the idea that eye movements are not dependant on stimulus size, at least for moderate stimulus sizes.

Finally, in the third experiment, we assessed the effect of different motion paradigms on smooth pursuit performance in a group of children using the animated stimulus. There were three reasons for undertaking this experiment in a group of children. First, the characteristics of our novel animated stimulus were designed to increase/maintain participants’ attention, with the expectation that this stimulus might be particularly salient to children. Second, stimulus characteristics seem to have a higher impact in children than in adults,\textsuperscript{13} and thus our stimulus might be expected to improve their oculomotor performance. Third, while most studies have used ramp paradigms to investigate smooth pursuit in adults,\textsuperscript{15-17} studies in children have used various motion paradigms, and therefore their results are often not comparable.\textsuperscript{6-8, 18, 19} Further complicating matters, it has been suggested that step-ramp motions are more appropriate for infants and young children,\textsuperscript{38} while sinusoidal motions are a better option for school age children.\textsuperscript{6, 20} However, these suggestions seem to be based more on the authors’ opinions and preferences than on scientific evidence. Interestingly, the values obtained for all the smooth pursuit parameters studied here were similar across the three different motions presented, and in fact, no significant differences were found between any of the motion paradigms. Hence, the motion paradigm used seemed to have little or no effect on smooth pursuit performance in children, at least with the animated stimulus presented here.

Overall, our results demonstrate that, contrary to previous studies, smooth pursuit performance can be improved in young adults with a more interesting and/or interactive stimulus. Of course, one could argue that the differences in smooth pursuit performance
found in experiment 1 between the animated and the unchanging dot stimuli could arise from the stimulus size, as these two were different in size. However, the results from experiment 2 showed that size of the stimulus (1° vs 2°) did not significantly affect smooth pursuit performance in a young adult population, supporting the view that the differences found in the previous experiment were due to the type rather than the size of the stimulus. Although the effects of stimulus type were studied here only in a young adult population, the improvement is likely to be even more evident in children.

**Conclusion**

Finally, this is an innovative and unique study as, to our knowledge, it is the first time that an animated stimulus has been utilised to study eye movements in adults and children. Although this study has focussed on smooth pursuit eye movements, the results may well be extrapolated generally to other eye movements and offer the possibility that performance can be improved significantly with attention-grabbing and dynamic (i.e. animated) stimuli. Therefore, we recommend the use of animated stimuli for the evaluation of smooth pursuit and fixation stability and further support the idea of using cartoon pictures as stimuli for saccades,\(^{13}\) especially in children. Of course, the importance of the choice of stimuli to evaluate eye movements should not only be considered for research purposes but also in clinical settings.
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**Figure 1.** Customised animated stimulus.

**Figure 2.** Diagram of the setup illustrating the distance of the eye-tracker from subject and the amplitude of the stimulus movement.
Figure 3. Customised child-friendly head stabiliser.

Figure 4. Velocity gain, position gain and proportion of smooth pursuit obtained from 20 young adults using the $2^\circ$ animated stimulus (circles) and the $1^\circ$ standard dot (squares).
**Figure 5.** Number of saccades and microsaccades obtained from 20 young adults using the $2^\circ$ animated stimulus (circles) and the $1^\circ$ standard dot (squares).

**Figure 6.** Velocity gain, position gain and proportion of smooth pursuit obtained from 9 young adults using the $1^\circ$ dot (circles) and for the $2^\circ$ dot stimulus (squares).
**Figure 7.** Number of saccades and microsaccades obtained from 9 young adults using the 1º standard dot (circles) and for the 2º standard dot stimulus (squares).

**Figure 8.** Velocity gain, position gain and proportion of smooth pursuit obtained from 12 children using the animated stimulus following a ramp (circles), step-ramp (squares) and sinusoidal (crosses) motion paradigms.
Figure 9. Number of saccades and microsaccades obtained from 12 children using the animated stimulus following a ramp (circles), step-ramp (squares) and sinusoidal (crosses) motion paradigms.

Supplemental Digital Content 1. Video that shows the eye movement recording of a 4 year old child using our customised setup and animated stimulus. mov
Table 1. Summary of the participants taking part, stimulus type and motion presented in each experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment 1</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Stimulus type</th>
<th>Stimulus motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 adults</td>
<td>2º animated</td>
<td>6º/sec ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1º standard dot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment 2</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Stimulus type</th>
<th>Stimulus motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 adults</td>
<td>1º standard dot</td>
<td>6º/sec ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2º standard dot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment 3</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Stimulus type</th>
<th>Stimulus motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 children</td>
<td>2º animated</td>
<td>6º/sec ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6º/sec step-ramp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Mean values for each smooth pursuit parameter obtained from twenty young adults using the animated and the dot stimuli.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smooth pursuit parameters</th>
<th>Animated stimulus Mean; 95% CI</th>
<th>Dot stimulus Mean; 95% CI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velocity gain</td>
<td>0.93; 0.90-0.96</td>
<td>0.87; 0.82-0.92</td>
<td>p=0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position gain</td>
<td>0.93; 0.85-1</td>
<td>0.82; 0.72-0.92</td>
<td>p=0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of smooth pursuit</td>
<td>0.94; 0.91-0.96</td>
<td>0.872; 0.83-0.90</td>
<td>p=0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of saccades</td>
<td>5.30; 3.64-6.96</td>
<td>7.75; 5.03-10.46</td>
<td>p=0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean amplitude of saccades</td>
<td>1.41; 1.16-1.66</td>
<td>1.34; 1.13-1.55</td>
<td>p=0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of microsaccades</td>
<td>10.25; 7.90-12.60</td>
<td>9.50; 6.68-11.31</td>
<td>p=0.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Mean values for each smooth pursuit parameter obtained from nine young adults using a 1º and a 2º dot stimuli.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smooth pursuit parameters</th>
<th>1º dot stimulus</th>
<th>2º dot stimulus</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean; 95% CI</td>
<td>Mean; 95% CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velocity gain</td>
<td>0.93; 0.89-0.97</td>
<td>0.91; 0.86-0.96</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position gain</td>
<td>0.87; 0.83-0.92</td>
<td>0.87; 0.81-0.92</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of smooth pursuit</td>
<td>0.90; 0.84-0.96</td>
<td>0.86; 0.78-0.93</td>
<td>0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of saccades</td>
<td>2.77; 0.51-5.04</td>
<td>4.44; 1.31-7.56</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean amplitude of saccades</td>
<td>1.23; 1.07-1.39</td>
<td>1.19; 1.09-1.28</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of microsaccades</td>
<td>14.22; 6.57-21.86</td>
<td>15.55; 3.15-27.95</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>