SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Comparisons between Two divided-attended locations:

For the divided-attended condition, we ran several comparisons between the data from the two divided-attended locations in each attentional cue group to confirm the two sets of data were comparable. The results of t-tests confirmed that for the early period of data there was no significant difference between the divided-attended locations in either accuracy (exogenous: p=0.543; endogenous/arrow: p=0.912; endogenous/color: p=0.857) or RT (exogenous: p=0.375; endogenous/arrow: p=0.260; endogenous/color: p=0.576). For the accuracy data during training, the results of a slope homogeneity analysis confirmed that there was no significant difference between the divided-attended locations in any of the attentional cue groups (exogenous: p=0.643; endogenous/arrow: p=0.719; endogenous/color: p=0.837). Also for the RT data during training, there was no significant difference between the divided-attended locations in any of the attentional cue groups (exogenous: p=0.247; endogenous/arrow: p=0.739; endogenous/color: p=0.619). For the contrast thresholds, a two-way (two locations x pre- vs. post-training sessions) ANOVA revealed that there were no significant main effect of location (exogenous: p=0.718; endogenous/arrow: p=0.985; endogenous/color: p=0.639) or interaction effect between location and session (exogenous: p=0.976; endogenous/arrow: p=0.447; endogenous/color: p=0.783). The results indicate that the performance and changes in it at the two divided-attended locations were quantitatively comparable.
Supplementary Figure 1. Changes in reaction time at the unattended location during training for the endogenous attention cue groups. Arrow: Endogenous/Arrow cue group, Color: Endogenous/Color cue group, Incorrect: incorrect trials, Correct: correct trials. Reaction time data for the correct trials are the same as the data shown in Figure 5.