## **Supplements**

Table S1. Spearman correlations between accuracy in change detections and the mean amplitudes and fractional area latencies (FAL) of the MMN and P3b, for each environment and target dimension, separated by age group (\*  $p \le .050$ ). Significance values were corrected based on the jackknifing procedure.

		M	MN		P3b						
	Mean A	mplitude	FA	L	Mean Ar	nplitude	FAL				
Accuracy / Target Dimension	Young	Old	Young	Old	Young	Old	Young	Old			
Real Azimuth	467 *	212	.199	.077	465 *	095	.165	.180			
Real Distance	145	417 *	.288	229	069	068	.261	.237			
Virtual Azimuth	073	381	.289	.228	.496 *	.196	.151	.319			
Virtual Distance	138	196	.201	.200	.363	.295	026	.370			

Table S2. Spearman correlations between the mean amplitudes and fractional area latencies (FAL) of the MMN and P3b, for each environment and target dimension, separated by age group (\*\*  $p \le .010$ ). Significance values were corrected based on the jackknifing procedure.

		P3b				
		Mean Amplitud				
MMN	Target Dimension	Young	Old			
	Real Azimuth	.612 **	.002			
Maan Amulituda	Real Distance	.176	397			
Mean Amphtude	Virtual Azimuth	.416	072			
	Virtual Distance	.298	120			
		FA	L			
	Real Azimuth	.297	110			
FAL	Real Distance	131	131			
	Virtual Azimuth	321	.083			
	Virtual Distance	.144	004			

Table S3. Results of the ANOVA for the effects of age (younger, older), environment (real, virtual), and target dimension (azimuth, near, far), and their interactions on detection accuracy, P1, N1, and P2 peak amplitudes as well as MMN and P3b mean amplitudes and fractional area latencies (FAL). F- and p-values were corrected based on the jackknifing procedure. Significant effects are marked in bold.

					P1		N1			P2			MMN					P3b						
	A	ccurac	у	Peak	Peak Amplitude		Peak Amplitude		Peak Amplitude		Mean Amplitude		tude	FAL			Mean Amplitude			FAL				
Effect	F	р	$\eta_p^2$	F	р	$\eta_p{}^2$	F	р	$\eta_p{}^2$	F	р	$\eta_p^2$	F	р	$\eta_p^2$	F	р	$\eta_p^2$	F	р	$\eta_p^2$	F	р	$\eta_p^2$
Age	1.24	.272	.029	3.48	.069	.076	5.43	.025	.114	9.21	.004	.180	4.46	.041	.096	0.41	.528	.010	0.51	.481	.012	0.10	.757	.002
Environment	3.37	.073	.074	1.95	.170	.044	0.02	.896	<.001	2.93	.094	.065	8.63	.005	.170	1.65	.206	.038	1.93	.002	.206	16.49	<.001	.282
Target Dimension	17.13	<.001	.290	0.59	.558	.014	1.01	.370	.023	1.54	.221	.035	31.32	<.001	.427	3.93	.023	.085	8.94	<.001	.176	161.82	<.001	.794
Age X Environment	1.05	.312	.024	< 0.01	.977	<.001	4.70	.036	.101	0.40	.531	.009	1.27	.267	.029	0.01	.905	<.001	1.13	.294	.026	0.48	.491	.011
Age X Target Dim.	0.25	.780	.006	0.81	.450	.019	0.07	.929	.002	1.25	.293	.029	0.25	.779	.006	0.52	.595	.012	0.58	.562	.014	2.23	.114	.050
Environment X Target Dim.	2.69	.074	.060	0.46	.631	.011	4.41	.015	.095	0.54	.587	.013	1.42	.247	.033	0.93	.400	.022	0.33	.719	.008	2.12	.126	.048
Age X Environment X Target Dim.	0.14	.867	.003	1.43	.246	.033	0.05	.953	.001	0.94	.395	.022	2.86	.063	.064	0.04	.960	.001	2.64	.077	.059	0.31	.735	.007



Figure S4. Accuracy in detecting azimuth, near, and far targets, shown separately for both environments and age groups. Horizontal bold lines represent the mean values of performance over all participants, vertical bars represent  $\pm$  one standard deviation, and dots indicate the individual mean accuracy values.

Table S5. Pairwise post-hoc analysis of the effects of target dimension (azimuth, near, far) on detection accuracy. Accuracy was logit-transformed prior to analyses. P-values were corrected for multiple testing using False Discovery Rate correction.

	<i>M</i> <sub>1</sub> ( <i>SD</i> <sub>1</sub> )	M2 (SD2)	Τ	р
Azimuth vs. Near	96.28 (5.77)	92.05 (14.41)	3.43	.002
Azimuth vs. Far	96.28 (5.77)	88.49 (13.61)	6.82	<.001
Near vs. Far	92.05 (14.41)	88.49 (13.61)	2.42	.020



Figure S6. Grand averaged ERP waveforms from standard (center position) and target (azimuth, near, far position) trials at electrodes Fz, F1, F2, FCz, FC1, and FC2, comparing the P1-N1-P2 complex in the real (solid lines) and virtual environment (dashed lines) for both age groups. Shaded areas beyond the waveforms refer to the range of +/- one standard error.

Table S7. Pairwise post-hoc analysis of the interaction effect of age (younger, older) and environment (real, virtual) on N1 peak amplitude, comparing mean differences. T- and pvalues were corrected based on the jackknifing procedure.

	Mdiff, real (SDdiff,real)	Mdiff,virtual (SDdiff,virtual)	Т	р
Real vs. Virtual	0.23 (0.03)	-0.20 (0.03)	2.17	.036

Table S8. Pairwise post-hoc analysis of the interaction effect of environment (real, virtual)and target dimension (azimuth, near, far) on N1 peak amplitude, comparing mean differences.T- and p-values were corrected based on the jackknifing procedure. P-values were correctedfor multiple testing using False Discovery Rate correction.

	Mdiff1 (SDdiff1)	Mdiff2 (SDdiff2)	Т	р
Azimuth vs. Near	-0.01 (0.19)	0.33 (0.23)	-0.62	.599
Azimuth vs. Far	-0.01 (0.19)	-0.28 (0.25)	0.53	.599
Near vs. Far	0.33 (0.23)	-0.28 (0.25)	1.30	.597



Figure S9. Grand-averaged ERP waveforms recorded in the real (solid lines) and virtual (dashed lines) environments for both age groups at electrodes AF4, AF8, Fz, F2, F4, F6, FCz, FC2, FC4, FT8, Cz, C2, C4, C6, and T8. First panel: ERPs elicited by standard and target stimuli. Second to fourth panels: ERP difference waveforms (target minus standard) showing the MMN evoked by sound changes to azimuth, near, and far targets. Shaded areas beyond the waveforms refer to the range of +/- one standard error. Topographic maps refer to the point in time when the area of the respective component reaches 50 percent (FAL).



Figure S10. Grand-averaged ERP waveforms recorded in the real (solid lines) and virtual (dashed lines) environments for both age groups at electrodes CP1, CPz, CP2, P1, Pz, and P2 Left panel: ERPs elicited by standard and target stimuli. First panel: ERPs elicited by standard and target stimuli. Second to fourth panels: ERP difference waveforms (target minus standard) showing the P3b evoked by sound changes to azimuth, near, and far targets. Shaded areas beyond the waveforms refer to the range of +/- one standard error. Topographic maps refer to the point in time when the area of the respective component reaches 50 percent (FAL).

Table S11. Pairwise post-hoc analysis of the effect of target dimension (azimuth, near, far) on MMN and P3b mean amplitudes and fractional area latencies (FAL). T- and p-values were corrected based on the jackknifing procedure. P-values were corrected for multiple testing using False Discovery Rate correction.

	MMN Mean Amplitude					MMN FAL			P3b	Mean Ampli	itude		P3b FAL			
	M1 (SD1)	M2 (SD2)	Τ	р	M1 (SD1)	M2 (SD2)	Т	р	M1 (SD1)	M2 (SD2)	Т	р	M1 (SD1)	M2 (SD2)	Τ	р
Azimuth vs. Near	-0.98 (0.21)	-0.25 (0.24)	2.39	.064	147.82 (5.97)	172.24 (35.88)	-0.15	.879	3.28 (0.44)	2.72 (0.42)	0.69	.741	449.78 (12.72)	526.41 (23.16)	-1.11	.275
Azimuth vs. Far	-0.98 (0.21)	-0.31 (0.26)	1.98	.080	147.82 (5.97)	211.56 (13.67)	-0.64	.879	3.28 (0.44)	2.59 (0.40)	1.15	.741	449.78 (12.72)	623.74 (29.74)	-1.28	.275
Near vs. Far	-0.25 (0.24)	-0.31 (0.26)	0.12	.908	172.24 (35.88)	211.56 (13.67)	0.49	.879	2.72 (0.42)	2.59 (0.40)	-0.10	.922	526.41 (23.16)	623.74 (29.74)	1.38	.275