Tables

Table 1: Overall table with included studies.

Study	Published	Sample Size	Mean Trials	WM Paradigm ^a	Blindingb	Acc Measure	Target	WM Task	Hedges's g	Hedges's g SE
Barton	Unpublished	17.00	116.00	CDT	CFS	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.26	0.24
(2018)	Unpublished	31.00	31.00	CDT	CFS	Accuracy	Bars	Identity	-0.14	0.18
Bergström	Published	21.00	84.00	DD	АВ	Accuracy	Letter	Identity	0.94	0.26
& Eriksson	Published	26.00	42.00	DD	АВ	Accuracy	Letter	Identity	0.76	0.22
(2014)	Published	26.00	22.00	DD	АВ	Accuracy	Letter	Identity	0.76	0.22
Bergström	Published	15.00	128.00	DMS	CFS	d'	Face	Identity- Location	0.54	0.26
& Eriksson (2015)	Published	16.00	194.00	DMS	CFS	d'	Tools	Identity- Location	0.75	0.27
Bergström	Published	25.00	174.00	DMS	CFS	d'	Tools	Identity- Location	0.62	0.21
& Eriksson (2018)	Published	26.00	107.00	DMS	CFS	d'	Tools	Identity- Location	0.10	0.19
Dutta et al. (2014)	Published	22.00	20.00	CDT	ВМ	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.55	0.22
	Published	15.00	43.00	CDT	ВМ	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.71	0.24
King et al. (2016)	Published	16.00	34.00	CDT	ВМ	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.38	0.25

 $^{^{\}circ}$ CDT = Change Detection Task, DD = Delayed Detection, DMS = Delayed Match-to-sample Task, DET = Delayed Estimation Task

 $^{^{\}mathrm{b}}\mathrm{CFS}=\mathrm{Continuous}$ Flash Suppression, AB = Attentional Blink, BM = Backward Masking, SM = Sandwich Masking, MM = Metacontrast Masking

Study	Published	Sample Size	Mean Trials	WM Paradigm ^a	Blindingb	Acc Measure	Target	WM Task	Hedges's g	Hedges's g SE
Nakano & Ishihara (2020)	Published	18.00	33.00	DMS	SM	Accuracy	Small Dot	Location	0.41	0.24
Pan (2014)	Published	20.00		CDT	ВМ	Accuracy	Face	Identity	0.26	0.22
	Published	7.00	26.00	CDT	вм	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	1.32	0.48
Soto et al.	Published	7.00	40.00	CDT	ВМ	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	1.28	0.47
(2011)	Published	9.00	40.00	CDT	ВМ	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	1.01	0.38
	Published	9.00	53.00	CDT	вм	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.89	0.37
	Unpublished	12.00	224.00	DD	CFS	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	0.27	0.27
	Unpublished	14.00	229.00	DD	CFS	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	0.22	0.25
Taglialatela	Unpublished	16.00	224.00	DD	CFS	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	0.27	0.24
Scafati (2017a)	Unpublished	19.00	347.00	DD	CFS	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	-0.19	0.22
	Unpublished	15.00	464.00	DD	CFS	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	0.22	0.25
	Unpublished	7.00	227.00	DD	CFS	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	-0.37	0.34
Taglialatela Scafati	Unpublished	13.00	220.00	DD	ВМ	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	0.00	0.26

 $^{{}^{}a}CD^{\dagger 7\underline{b}}$ Change Detection Task, DD = Delayed Detection, DMS = Delayed Match-to-sample Task, DET = Delayed Estimation Task

 $^{^{\}mathrm{b}}\mathrm{CFS}=\mathrm{Continuous}$ Flash Suppression, AB = Attentional Blink, BM = Backward Masking, SM = Sandwich Masking, MM = Metacontrast Masking

Study	Published	Sample Size	Mean Trials	WM Paradigm ^a	Blindingb	Acc Measure	Target	WM Task	Hedges's g	Hedges's g SE
	Unpublished	10.00	124.00	DD	ВМ	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	-0.20	0.29
	Unpublished	16.00	233.00	DD	ВМ	Accuracy	Pictures	Identity	0.04	0.24
Taglialatela	Unpublished	18.00	222.00	DD	ВМ	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	0.20	0.23
Scafati (2017c)	Unpublished	18.00	176.00	DD	ВМ	Accuracy	Playing Cards	Location	0.07	0.23
	Unpublished	22.00	9.00	CDT	вм	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.03	0.21
Taglialatela	Unpublished	12.00	13.00	CDT	ВМ	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.23	0.27
Scafati (2017rep)	Unpublished	22.00	3.00	CDT	вм	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.10	0.21
	Unpublished	22.00	11.00	CDT	вм	Accuracy	Gabor Patch	Identity	0.00	0.21
Trübutschek	Published	17.00	80.00	DET	ММ	Accuracy	Square	Location	1.24	0.31
et al. (2017)	Published	19.00	62.00	DET	ММ	Accuracy	Square	Location	1.63	0.34
Trübutschek et al. (2019a)	Published	38.00	174.00	DET	ММ	Accuracy	Square	Location	1.70	0.22
Trübutschek	Published	23.00	47.00	DET	ММ	Accuracy	Square	Location	0.96	0.21
et al. (2019b)	Published	30.00	129.00	DET	ММ	Accuracy	Square	Location	1.07	0.20

 $^{^{\}mathrm{a}}$ CDT = Change Detection Task, DD = Delayed Detection, DMS = Delayed Match-to-sample Task, DET = Delayed Estimation Task

 $^{^{\}mathrm{b}}\mathrm{CFS}=\mathrm{Continuous}$ Flash Suppression, AB = Attentional Blink, BM = Backward Masking, SM = Sandwich Masking, MM = Metacontrast Masking

Table 2: Metaregression table. For each fitted model and parameter is reported the posterior distribution summary using the median as point estimate and the 89% HPDI. Furthermore for relevant parameters is reported the percentage of the 89% HPDI within/outside the ROPE.

				89% HPDI		RO	OPE
Model	Parameter	Effect	SE	Low	High	% Within	% Outside
	AB	0.78	0.35	0.23	1.33	0	1
	ВМ	0.34	0.13	0.13	0.55	0.01	0.99
Disable o De ve dieve	CFS	0.25	0.18	-0.03	0.54	0.17	0.83
~ Blinding Paradigm	ММ	1.33	0.22	0.98	1.68	0	1
	Tau Paper	0.30	0.10	0.16	0.46		
	Tau Study	0.06	0.05	0.00	0.14		
	150-500ms	0.30	0.32	-0.22	0.81	0.25	0.75
	16-50ms	0.63	0.18	0.35	0.91	0	1
~ Target Duration	3000ms	0.46	0.40	-0.16	1.11	0.16	0.84
	Tau Paper	0.52	0.13	0.34	0.72		
	Tau Study	0.06	0.05	0.00	0.14		
	Average	0.57	0.16	0.32	0.82	0	1
	Trials	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	1	0
~ Trials + Sample Size	Sample Size	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	0
0.20	Tau Paper	0.53	0.13	0.35	0.74		
	Tau Study	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.14		
	CDT	0.38	0.17	0.11	0.64	0.02	0.98
	DD	0.25	0.20	-0.05	0.56	0.19	0.81
NAMA David di succ	DET	1.34	0.24	0.95	1.71	0	1
~ WM Paradigm	DMS	0.45	0.24	0.07	0.82	0.04	0.96
	Tau Paper	0.34	0.10	0.20	0.49		
	Tau Study	0.06	0.05	0.00	0.14		
~ Author	Barton	0.01	0.25	-0.36	0.41	0.66	0.34
	Bergstrom	0.60	0.15	0.37	0.82	0	1
	Dutta	0.61	0.26	0.20	1.01	0	1
	King	0.37	0.32	-0.13	0.90	0.18	0.82
-	Nakano	0.40	0.31	-0.09	0.89	0.14	0.86
	Pan	0.25	0.30	-0.23	0.73	0.29	0.71
	Soto	1.07	0.29	0.61	1.51	0	1
-	TaglialatelaScafati	0.07	0.12	-0.11	0.25	0.63	0.37
-	Trubutschek	1.30	0.16	1.06	1.57	0	1

				89% HPDI		RO	OPE
Model	Parameter	Effect	SE	Low	High	% Within	% Outside
	Tau Paper	0.15	0.11	0.00	0.29		
	Tau Study	0.07	0.05	0.00	0.15		
	Implicit - Explicit	-0.57	0.38	-1.16	0.04		
la atau ati a a a	Average	0.62	0.14	0.39	0.84		
~ Instructions	Tau Paper	0.47	0.12	0.30	0.65		
	Tau Study	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.15		
	Average	0.54	0.14	0.32	0.77	0	1
Overall Model	Tau Paper	0.50	0.12	0.33	0.68		
	Tau Study	0.06	0.05	0.00	0.14		
	Average	0.78	0.15	0.55	1.02	0	1
Overall Model (only published)	Tau Paper	0.40	0.16	0.16	0.67		
,	Tau Study	0.12	0.11	0.00	0.28		

Table 3: LOOIC-CV table. For each model is reported the LOOIC value, the standard error, the associated weight and the percentage of explained heterogeneity

Model	Estimate	SE	Weight	R ² _{level-2}	R ² _{level-3}
~ Author	-7.66	3.56	0.03	0.00	0.91
~ Blinding Paradigm	-4.93	2.65	0.45	0.13	0.63
~ WM Paradigm	-4.92	2.60	0.46	0.09	0.54
~ Target Duration	-8.18	3.58	0.02	0.04	0.00
~ Trials + Sample Size	-8.10	3.54	0.02	0.00	0.00
Overall Model	-8.11	3.97	0.02	0.00	0.00