Dear Professor Payne,

Dear Keith,

We hope you are well. We would like to thank you for your recent review of our manuscript titled “The AMPeror’s New Clothes: Performance in the Affect Misattribution Procedure is Mainly Driven by Awareness of Influence of the Primes” submitted to JPSP. We are extremely grateful for your thoughtful, thorough, and comprehensive comments.

We are currently busy revising this manuscript based on your feedback. The main issue that you raised was that our measure of awareness (i.e., pressing the spacebar after responses on each trial) was still a retrospective measure of influence awareness, and thus ultimately still susceptible to post-hoc confabulation. We therefore want to conduct a new study that will overcome this issue. Specifically, we would like to run a study that can speak to the moderating role (if any) that prospective awareness of prime influence has on AMP effects.

Our idea is to once again use the IA-AMP paradigm that we developed, which is highly similar to the skip-paradigm you used in Experiment 3 of Payne et al. (2013). Rather than allow participants to skip trials if they felt that they would be influenced by a prime (as you did in your 2013 article), the IA-AMP instead asked them to respond to every trial, and thereafter indicate if that response was influenced by the prime (i.e., by pressing the spacebar during a fixed 2000ms post-response interval).

In your review you argued that participants were still making these judgements of awareness after their evaluative response, which thererfore still leaves our measure of awareness vulnerable to post-hoc confabulation. To address this we would like to run a new study with the IA-AMP. But now we would present the prime followed by the target, and immediately ask participants if their subsequent evaluation of the target *will be* influenced by the prime. Only then will they emitan evaluative response to the target. By asking them to report on the primes influence on their target evaluation before they emit that evaluation we would avoid the issue of retrospective confabulation that was raised in response to our previous studies.

From our perspective, such an approach overcomes the issue of retrospective self-report which you pointed out as an issue in our manuscript. It would also simultaneously provide more information than the original 2013 paradigm (i.e., it would allow us to compare within-subject AMP effects based on trials which are prospectively described as influenced vs. uninfluenced).

Before investing time and effort into collecting data for such a study, we would like your opinion on whether such a design (and corresponding findings) would convince you that influence awareness moderates the AMP effect. In other words, do you think that such a method would address your concern about the potential for post-hoc confabulation, and avoid the issue of potential voodoo correlations? And more generally, do you think that this revised method would be a better-suited method for both ourselves and future researchers to investigate the role of influence awareness in AMP effects?

If you have the opportunity to provide us with any feedback on this revised version of our paradigm, we would greatly appreciate it. We have attached the experimental script of the revised paradigm to this email. We also would like to thank you again for taking the time to review our manuscript and for providing critical and highly useful feedback.

Best regards,

Jamie Cummins

Ian Hussey

Sean Hughes