**Metadata for Baldwin and Meese (2015) Journal of Vision.**

*Participants*

Tim Meese

Alex Baldwin

*Organisations*

Centre for Vision and Hearing Research

Basic and Applied Neurosciences Group

*Description*

These data are psychophysical results for percent correct in two-alternative forced-choice for three different observers (ASB, DHB and TSM; different columns in the spread sheet) from the research paper published in Journal of Vision by Baldwin and Meese (2015): "Fourth-root summation of contrast over area in the central visual field: no end in sight spatially inhomogeneous sensitivity is compensated by a witch's hat."

The stimuli and methods are described in the open access research paper available at the Journal of Vision website. The results for the four different types of visual stimuli are shown on different pages. Different blocks are for different stimulus sizes. The number of trials and number of correct responses are shown in different columns for each of the 4 replications (runs). The different columns are for different contrasts as explained in the research paper. Using the standard methods described in the paper, psychometric functions can be fitted to these data to extract the ‘thresholds’ and the ‘psychometric slopes’ that are averaged across the 3 observers and plotted in the results figures (figs 2, 3 & 4).