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**Participant A**

1. Participant Awas significantly more focused on the screen while using VVSD than SVSD.
2. Almost no eye contact was observed with the mediatorduring VVSD. In SVSD, eye contact with the mediator was slightly greater.
3. There were too few correct clicks (only in one instance), so it wasn’t easy to conclude. The level of accuracy is shown in Figure S2, and the total number of attempts (all clicks) is shown in Figure S1.
4. Verbal mediation - verbal mediation appeared only in one session (not observed in the second session or mixed with physical mediation). In this session, SVSD and VVSD were almost the same percentages, with a slight advantage for VVSD.
5. Due to the small number of events, there were no unequivocal conclusions pointing to mediation.
6. In one session, the physical mediation was significantly greater in SVSD than in VVSD. In contrast, in the second session, the physical mediation in VVSD was twice greater than in SVSD.
7. It seems that the physical mediation was higher in VVSD compared to SVSD.
8. Smiles - it isn't easy to draw unequivocal conclusions since one time, there were more smiles in VVSD, and another time, more smiles were seen in SVSD.
9. In the experiment analysis, it was not possible to pay constant attention to the response time. Still, it can be seen in Figure S3 that the participant's response time was shorter in the VVSD.

Additional comments from the transcripts:

It seems that Participant A was more focused during the VSD video. Also, the participant expressed a very high curiosity towards the VSD video, made loud noises during the VVSD, and looked the mediator in the eyes many times.

In conclusion, the questionnaire shows that Participant A was more interested in VVSD than SVSD. There were more body language expressions in the VSD video. There is no unequivocal conclusion regarding mediation.

**Participant B**

1. **Participant B** looked at the tablet throughout the whole experiment. In SVSD, Participant **B** was slightly more focused on the screen than in VVSD.
2. There was almost no eye contact with the mediator.
3. According to the transcripts, there were more correct clicks in SVSD compared to VVSD. The level of accuracy is shown in Figure S2, and the total number of attempts (all clicks) is shown in Figure S1.
4. Verbal mediation was observed in SVSD only. Although there was verbal mediation in the VVSD, it was accompanied by physical mediation. Therefore, we categorize this mediation as physical because the physical aspect is stronger. Physical mediation was forced in comparison to other types of mediation, so it is difficult to determine whether the verbal mediation that was also present affected the situation.
5. There were no unequivocal conclusions in pointing mediation due to the small number of events.
6. It seems that the physical mediation was higher in SVSD compared to VVSD.
7. Different body language expressions were observed (stretching or yawning). Part of the time, this was observed more in SVSD, and part of the time, it was observed more in VVSD.
8. It is difficult to conclude smiles because of the small number of events.
9. In the experiment analysis, paying constant attention to the response time was impossible. Still, it can be seen in Figure S3 that the participant's response time was shorter in the VVSD.VVSD

Additional comments from the transcripts:

Participant **B** made significantly more body movements during the video. \The participant cooperated well with the mediator and clicked on the screen. In general, Participant B was very interested in both SVSD and VVSD, was focused on the tablet, and hardly took his eyes off it.

In conclusion, Participant **B** focused more on VVSD than SVSD. The participant's video focus was observed in several locations–the questionnaire showed more interest in VVSD, and the level of mediation in VVSD was also lower.

On the other hand, in SVSD, a higher number of correct clicks was observed.

No unequivocal conclusion was found regarding body language.

**Participant C**

1. Participant **C** was significantly more focused on the screen using VVSD than SVSD.
2. The eye contact that was observed was very rare.
3. Specifically, Participant C did not make many correct clicks, but the few that were correct were related to the VVSD**.** The level of accuracy is shown in Figure S2, and the total number of attempts (all clicks) is shown in Figure S1.
4. Verbal mediation - few events were observed, but verbal mediation appears slightly more in SVSD than in VVSD.
5. There were no unequivocal conclusions in pointing mediation due to the small number of events.
6. In “Sports Day,” the physical mediation was similar in VVSD and SVSD. In “Birthday,” a significant decrease in physical mediation can be detected in VVSD.
7. The physical mediation was lower in VVSD compared to SVSD.
8. Smiles - it isn't easy to draw unequivocal conclusions since one time there were more smiles in VVSD and another time in SVSD.
9. In the experiment analysis, paying attention to the response time unequivocally was impossible. Still, it can be seen in Figure S3 that the participant's response time was shorter in the VVSD.

Additional comments from the transcripts:

Participant **C** seems to enjoy the VSD video more. Also, in the VVSD, the participant tried to click on the screen more times than in the SVSD (the attempts were not counted for SVSD). In addition, in the VVSD, the participant repeated words in Hebrew that the mediator told him (it should be noted that the participant does not speak Hebrew daily).

Participant **C**'s behavior was observed in several areas: the questionnaire showed more interest in VVSD, the expression of body language in VVSD was higher, and the number of correct clicks in VVSD was higher than in SVSD. In addition, it seemed that the participant experienced more pleasure during VVSD. Also, the participant said words in Hebrew while watching the VVSD. In conclusion, Participant **C** was more interested and successful in VVSD than SVSD.

**Participant D**

* + - 1. Participant **D** was significantly more focused on the screen VVSD using VVSD than SVSD.

1. Almost no eye contact was observed with the mediatorduring the experiment.
2. A significantly higher number of correct clicks was observed in VVSD than in SVSD. The level of accuracy is shown in Figure S2, and the total number of attempts (all clicks) is shown in Figure S1.
3. Verbal mediation observations were ambiguous (sometimes more were observed in SVSD and sometimes in VVSD). Again, this is problematic for classification because sometimes verbal mediation is mixed with more dominant forms of mediation.
4. It seems that pointing mediation was higher in VVSD than in SVSD.
5. It seems that the physical mediation was higher in SVSD compared to VVSD.
6. Different body language expressions were observed (stretching or yawning). Part of the time, this was observed more in SVSD and part of the time in VVSD.
7. It was not possible to conclude the smiles because they were not observed.
8. In the experiment analysis, it was not possible to pay constant attention to the response time, but it can be seen in Figure S3 that the participant's response time was shorter in the SVSD.

Additional comments from the transcripts:

Participant **D** expressed body language through compulsive and stereotypical rocking in SVSD. In the VVSD, this rocking stopped completely.

In conclusion, Participant **D** was more interested and successful in VVSD than SVSD. Participant **D** was observed in several areas–the questionnaire shows more interest in VVSD, and the number of correct clicks in VVSD was significantly higher than in SVSD. Regarding mediation and body language, no unequivocal conclusion was found.

During VVSD, the compulsive expression of body language stopped completely compared to SVSD.

**Participant E**

1. For Participant **E**, there was no unequivocal trend regarding viewing the tablet. In one event, more activity was observed in SVSD, and in another, more activity was seen in VVSD.
2. Eye contact with the mediator - in one event, it was the same between SVSD and VVSD; in another, eye contact was more significant in VVSD.
3. More correct clicks were observed in VVSD than in SVSD. The level of accuracy is shown in Figure S2, and the total number of attempts (all clicks) is shown in Figure S1.
4. Verbal mediation was rarely observed, so reaching an unequivocal conclusion is difficult. The inability to reach a definitive conclusion regarding Participant **E** lies in the fact that there was a massive verbal mediation combined with other ways of mediation, which are “stronger” than verbal mediation.
5. There were no unequivocal conclusions in pointing mediation due to the small number of events.
6. Physical mediation - there is no unequivocal conclusion (sometimes there was more physical mediation in SVSD and sometimes in VVSD).
7. Different body language expressions were observed (stretching or yawning). Part of the time, this behavior was observed more in SVSD and part of the time, it was observed more in VVSD.
8. Smiles - it isn't easy to draw unequivocal conclusions because one time, there were more smiles in VVSD and another time, more smiles were seen in SVSD.
9. In the experiment analysis, paying constant attention to the response time unequivocally was impossible. Still, it can be seen in Figure S3 that the participant's response time was shorter in the VVSD.

Additional comments from the transcripts:

In the SVSD, Participant **E** presented several visual discomfort behaviors, moving in the chair, leaning, and touching things. In contrast, in the VVSD, the participant seems focused on the video and leans forward to bring his face closer to the tablet.

In conclusion, Participant **E** was more interested in VVSD and even had more success there (correct clicks). No unequivocal conclusions were found in the other parameters (mediation, eye contact, and body language).

**Participant F**

1. Participant **F** was significantly more focused on the screen using VVSD than SVSD.
2. Almost no eye contact was observed with the mediatorduring the experiment.
3. More correct clicks were observed in SVSD compared to VVSD. The level of accuracy is shown in Figure S2, and the total number of attempts (all clicks) is shown in Figure S1.
4. Verbal mediation - few events were observed, but verbal mediation appears slightly more often in SVSD than in VVSD. There were other cases of verbal mediation, but they were mixed with physical mediation that happened simultaneously and was more dominant.
5. There were no unequivocal conclusions in pointing mediation due to the small number of events.
6. VVSD Physical mediation seemed to be higher in VVSD than in SVSD.
7. There were fewer body language expressions (stretching or yawning) in SVSD compared to VVSD.
8. Smiles - it isn't easy to draw unequivocal conclusions since one time there were more smiles in VVSD and another time in SVSD.
9. In the experiment analysis, paying constant attention to the response time unequivocally was impossible. Still, it can be seen in Figure S3 that the participant's response time was shorter in the SVSD.

Additional comments from the transcripts:

With Participant **F**, it seemed that before working with the tablet (both in video and SVSD), he expressed a lot of antagonism to the activity, wanted to go home, and was not focused. As soon as the work started, he became focused on the tablet, showed interest, enjoyed working, and did not want to leave anymore.

In conclusion, Participant **F** was very interested in the VVSD, which can be seen in the questionnaire and the general impression. Different body language expressions were more numerous in VVSD. On the other hand, the number of correct clicks was higher in SVSD. There are no unequivocal conclusions regarding mediation.