**Supplemental Study**

We planned to have both drink condition (alcohol vs. non-alcohol) and image set randomized and counterbalanced across sessions 1 and 2. Unfortunately, once 36 participants’ data had been collected, we realized that the randomization for these two factors (drink condition and image set) was the same, such that image set 1 was presented on each alcohol session and image set 2 was presented on each control session. We planned to present inverse pairings (image set 2 on the alcohol session and image set 1 on the control sessions) for the final 20 participants from whom we had intended to collect data. Due to Covid-19, however, all nonessential research activities at the University of Pittsburgh were mandatorily suspended (Rutenbar et al., 2020) and the final 20 participants’ data could not be collected. Consequently, it was necessary to consider other approaches to disentangle an effect of drink condition from an effect of the image set. That is, although an alcohol effect was not observed in the main study, it was possible that if image set 1 were simply less attractive than image set 2, a positive effect of alcohol would have been masked in the analyses reported above. Thus, we conducted a supplemental study with new participants (*n* = 34) via an online platform, to assess differences in attractiveness ratings between the two image sets and to facilitate clearer interpretation of results from the main study.

**Supplemental Study Aim**

The aim of the supplementary study was to examine the effect of image set on PPA.

**Method**

***Participants***

Participants were recruited via an online participant recruitment platform, Prolific ([www.prolific.co](http://www.prolific.co); last accessed 6/1/2020). To ensure consistency with the main study, eligible participants had to be male, between the ages of 21–28, report English fluency, and deny having uncorrected visual impairment. Participants also were required to complete the survey on a desktop, laptop, or tablet, as survey formatting was not compliant with phones. Participants were prescreened automatically via Prolific.co, which requests users enter basic demographic information.

***Procedure***

Participants (*n* = 34) who were deemed eligible via Prolific screening tools were directed to the PPA survey hosted on Qualtrics (Provo, UT). The survey began with questions regarding basic demographic information, which facilitated validation of participants’ response to the Prolific prescreen. Participants were then sequentially presented with the two images sets and asked to rate the attractiveness of each image within each set. To control for order effects, half the participants were presented with image set 1 followed by image set 2, while the other half were presented with image set 2 followed by image set 1. Once participants completed the survey, they were redirected to the Prolific website and were paid $7.50 for their survey completion.

***Materials***

**Attractiveness rating task.**  The attractiveness rating task and specific image sets were the same as those used in the main study.

***Attractiveness ratings.*** Ratings were reported using a Likert scale of 1 (*very unattractive*) to 10 (*very attractive*).

**Demographics.** Participants reported their demographic information prior to the start of the rating task.

***Analytic Plan***

The analytic strategy for the supplemental study mirrored that of the main study with regard to software used and model assumption assessments. The PPA variable had no error outliers, and good skewness (0.18) and kurtosis (-0.40) (Kim, 2013; West et al., 1995). All PPA ratings of 10 were outliers based on the standard deviation analysis. Analyses described below did not differ based on inclusion of outliers, thus, results are reported based on analyses in which outliers were retained.

To examine the effect of image set on PPA, image set was entered as a fixed effect. Intercepts for perceivers nested within study versions (wherein study version represented the two possible orderings of the image sets) and targets were entered as random effects, to account for non-independence of responses within each grouping. A likelihood ratio test was used to compare the full model with the main effect of image set against a model with the effect of image set removed. The *p*-value yielded by the model comparison was assessed to determine if the effect of image set was significant.

**Results and Discussion**

***Participants***

The supplementary study sample consisted of 34 eligible participants. Participants’ ages ranged from 21-28 (mean = 23.24, sd = 1.96). The majority of participants were White (n = 26 White, 2 Asian, 2 Black, 4 more than one race) and heterosexual (27 heterosexual, 7 bisexual).

***Supplemental Study Aim***

Image set did not significantly affect PPA [*X*2 (1, *N* = 34) = 0.41, *p* =.52]. The mean PPA among image set 1 was 4.61 (sd = 2.02) and the mean PPA among image set 2 was 4.43 (sd = 2.15). We additionally tested the effect of study version to account for potential order effects. While there was not a main effect of study version [*X*2 (1, *N* = 34) = 3.04, *p* =.08], the interaction between study version and image set significantly enhanced model fit [*X*2 (1, *N* = 34) = 34.82, *p* <.001]. As seen in Supplemental Table 1, PPA ratings were comparable across image sets among participants who viewed image set 1 prior to image set two. Most pertinent to the present research, the difference in PPA by image sets among participants rating image set 2 prior to image set 1 suggested a trend that would have made it *more* likely to observe an effect of alcohol in the primary study (i.e., the image set rated in the alcohol condition received higher ratings than that rated in the non-alcohol condition in the primary study). Taken together, the data from this supplementary study suggest I can rule out the methodological explanation that a positive effect of alcohol on PPA in the primary study was simply masked by participants rating a less attractive image set on the alcohol session as compared to the control sessions. That is, the null finding of alcohol on PPA in the main study cannot be explained due to unbalanced image sets.

Supplemental Study Table 1

*Supplemental Study PPA ratings by Image Set and Study Version*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Study Version 1: Image set 1 Rated First** | *Mean* | *SD* |
| Image Set 1 | 4.86 | 2.24 |
| Image Set 2 | 4.94 | 2.32 |
|  |  |  |
| **Study Version 2: Image set 2 Rated First** | *Mean* | *SD* |
| Image Set 1 | 4.37 | 1.73 |
| Image Set 2 | 3.91 | 1.83 |

*Note.* SD = standard deviation.