



**Figure 3 - Supplement 3: Perceived synchrony under different levels of visual noise.** A. Colored dots represent the mean reported proportion of stimulation perceived as synchronous (SEM) for each asynchrony for the 0% (dark blue), 30% (light blue), and 50% (cyan) noise conditions. B. Bars represent how many times in the 84 trials the participants answered ‘yes [the touches I felt and the ones I saw were synchronous]’ under the 0% (dark blue), 30% (light blue), and 50% (cyan) noise conditions. There was a significant increase in the number of ‘yes’ answers when the visual noise increased \*  $p < .05$ . The participants reported perceiving synchronous visuotactile taps in 89.5% (mean SEM) of the 12 trials when the visual and tactile stimulations were synchronous; more precisely, 85.4%, 90.2%, and 93.2% of responses were “yes” responses for the conditions with 0, 30, and 50% visual noise, respectively. When the rubber hand was touched 300 ms before the real hand, the taps were perceived as synchronous in 18.5% of the 12 trials (noise level 0: 15.4 noise level 30: 18.5%, and noise level 50: 22.5%); when the rubber hand was touched 300 ms after the real hand, visuotactile synchrony was reported in only 22.5% of the 12 trials (noise level 0: 19.4%, noise level 30: 20.4%, and noise level 50: 26.5%, main effect of asynchrony:  $F(6, 84) = 21.5, p < .001$ ). Moreover, regardless of asynchrony, the participants perceived visuotactile synchrony more often when the level of visual noise increased but post-hoc tests showed that this difference was only significant between the most extreme conditions of noise ( $F(2, 28) = 5.78, p = .008$ ; Holmes’ post hoc test: noise level 0 versus noise level 30:  $p =$

.30  $d_{avg} = 0.2$ ; noise level 30 versus noise level 50:  $p = .34$ ,  $d_{avg} = 0.2$ ; noise level 0 versus noise level 50:  $p = .01$   $d_{avg} = 0.4$ ). The table below summarizes the mean ( $\pm$ SEM) the number of trials perceived as synchronous by the participants.