Hi, Mike and everyone,

Sorry for my delay in getting back to you. Some family medical emergency occurred and things were piled up in the past month. I’m finally catching up a little bit.

Please see below for the data and responses to your questions. Please let me know if you have other questions. We could replicate the exact same results as reported in the paper.

*1. We can't compute '(G) and '(B), because we don't have access to data from C-alone trials. Would you consider sharing these data as well?*

The data:

Attached are the two ascii data sets we used.

One for the good type of face called GFq for g = good type of face;the other is for the bad type of face called BFq for b = bad type of face.

Columns are

G&F G&D B&F B&D Falone Galone

category- action                  Dec alone   Cat alone

G&W G&A B&W B&A         W                G

*2. We are unable to compute the other descriptives due to some confusion about the participant-filtering procedure that you have used.*

We only included participants that made at least one incorrect categorization of a type of face. That is:

Only Ps that categorized Good at least once when face was b = bad guy type face.

Only Ps that categorized Bad at least once when face was g = good guy type face.

*We are unable to compute the other descriptives due to some confusion about the participant-filtering procedure that you have used. In particular, we note that you have filtered "optimizers" based on their results on a particular face type, but your data are broken down by base category (good vs. bad) rather than face type.*

I wonder where you get this impression…

The data is broken down by face type. Please see p. 134 in our paper:

“…As shown in the first two rows of Table 1, when a face was most frequently assigned to the good guy category (we denote this type of face as type g faces)…However, when a face was most frequently assigned to the bad guy category (we denote this type of face as type b faces), …”

From Table 1 notes on p.135:

“The symbols **g,** **b**refer to the type of face stimulus, the symbols **G,** **B**refer to the two categories, and…”

*We note that exclusions in Table 1 appear to be filtered by base category,*

No.

Instead, by type of face (g vs. b, which refer to type of face and not category answered by the Ps).

*however (e.g., 169 total participants - 43 participants excluded on wide faces = 126 participants reported in table 1 for bad faces),*

As said above, 169 saw bad faces, 43 of these always categorized this as bad (zero good face categories when it was a b = bad type face);

169 saw good faces, 31 of these always categorized this as a good face (zero bad guy face categories when it was a g = good guy type face).

This is explained on p.137 of our paper:

“Some participants, whom we call ‘‘optimizers,” always chose the ‘‘optimal” category for a particularly type of face on C-D trials: 43 did so for the narrow faces and 31 did so for the wide faces (approximately 25% and 18%, respectively, of the 169 participants).

These participants obey the law of total probability for either type of face for trivial reasons, and for these participants, we cannot estimate the conditional probabilities for non-chosen categories and thus cannot really estimate the total probability for an action

decision.”