Comparing the suitability of 6 implicit measures for individual use

*Deviations from pre-registration*

# 

**Added exclusions for incorrect number of trials**

After running the analyses on the testing dataset we realised that the processing script did not include exclusions for an incorrect number of trials present in the data. Instances of both too few trials (e.g., incomplete study completion) and too many (duplicate data, database errors, other unknown sources) were present in the data. Their confidence intervals were inappropriately wide or narrow, respectively, not because of their performance on the task as it is typically presented but because they did not complete it or had additional trials for some reason. We excluded participants who did not have the prespecified number of trials for each task. A code chunk preceded by the heading “retain only session\_ids with the correct number of trials” was added to processing.Rmd:

```{r}

session\_with\_complete\_n\_trials <- critical\_trials\_df |>

count(SESSION\_ID, domain, measure) |>

filter((measure == "amp" & n == 48) |

(measure == "iat" & n == 120) |

(measure == "biat" & n == 128) |

(measure == "siat" & n == 192) |

(measure == "gnat" & n == 160) |

(measure == "ept" & n == 180))

critical\_trials\_complete\_tasks <- critical\_trials\_df |>

semi\_join(session\_with\_complete\_n\_trials, by = "SESSION\_ID")

```