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**Experiment 1 description**

Does the matching of avatar images to photos of real-life counterparts correlate with other established tests of face matching?

* Avatar matching task: Observers matched 40 screenshots of avatars to portrait photos of real people. Half of these trials were identity match trials, and half were identity mismatch trials.
* Glasgow Face Matching Test (Burton et al., 2010) and Kent Face Matching Test (Fysh & Bindemann, 2018): In each test, observers matched 40 images of real faces, half of which were identity matches, and the remainder were identity mismatches.
* Data were collected using Gorilla online survey software. The order of face matching tests were counterbalanced.
* Accuracy, sensitivity, and mean correct responses times, were correlated across tests for overall accuracy, as well as for match and mismatch accuracy. Data were also analysed via a 3 (test: Avatars, GFMT, KFMT) x 2 (trial type: match versus mismatch) within-subjects ANOVA.

**Experiment 2 description**

Does the matching of dynamic avatars in a VR airport to photos of real-life counterparts correlate with other established tests of face matching?

* Airport task: Observers matched 40 avatars (20 match, 20 mismatch) to digital photographs in a virtual reality airport.
* Glasgow Face Matching Test (Burton et al., 2010) and Kent Face Matching Test (Fysh & Bindemann, 2018): In each test, observers matched 40 images of real faces, half of which were identity matches, and the remainder were identity mismatches.
* Airport task data were collected using Vizard 6, KFMT and GFMT data were collected using PsychoPy. The order of face matching tests were counterbalanced.
* Accuracy, sensitivity, and mean correct responses times, were correlated across tests for overall accuracy, as well as for match and mismatch accuracy. Data were also analysed via a 3 (test: Avatars, GFMT, KFMT) x 2 (trial type: match versus mismatch) within-subjects ANOVA.

**Experiment 3 description**

Does the matching of dynamic avatars in a VR airport to photos of real-life counterparts correlate with other established tests of face matching, and is performance in this task stable across testing sessions?

* Airport task: Observers matched 80 avatars (40 match, 40 mismatch) to digital photographs in a virtual reality airport.
* Glasgow Face Matching Test (Burton et al., 2010) and Kent Face Matching Test (Fysh & Bindemann, 2018): In each test, observers matched 40 images of real faces, half of which were identity matches, and the remainder were identity mismatches.
* The three tests were administered twice, with an interval of seven days between Sessions 1 and 2.
* Airport task data were collected using Vizard 6, KFMT and GFMT data were collected using PsychoPy. The order of face matching tests were counterbalanced.
* Accuracy, sensitivity, and mean correct responses times, were correlated across tests for overall accuracy, as well as for match and mismatch accuracy, and across test sessions. Data were also analysed via a 3 (test: Avatars, GFMT, KFMT) x 2 (trial type: match versus mismatch) x 2 (session: Session 1 versus Session 2) within-subjects ANOVA.