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## Introduction

A citation with 🡪 after word means that the articles that come after the arrow are from the paper that appears before the arrow.

### Background

Unconscious effects are notoriously small and week. This raises a doubt about the existence of these effects. This has been the topic of a burning debate for the past few years.

@@ quote articles that show priming and the articles that contradict them @@

Trajectory tracking has become a popular tool for revealing the development of cognitive effects because of the rich data it provides.

When considering keyboard response, it can be understood that it represents only the final decision after the subjects have already made their mind. In contrast, when using motion tracking subjects can start moving before making their final choice and correct their trajectory on the fly. The changes in trajectory will reveal the cognitive conflicts on the way to formulating the final response.

@@ describe articles that used motion /mouse tracking due to its higher sensitivity @@

If so, trajectory tracking might be a preferable venue for researchers studying unconscious processing. However, to date, in the context of unconscious effects, only one study made a direct comparison between this measure and a classic dichotomous keyboard response measure. @@ quote Assessing Masked Semantic Priming: Cursor Trajectory versus Response Time Measures @@

However responding with a mouse requires subjects to remap the representation of the stimuli in the real world into the 2D screen representations, this transformation could affect the trajectory and timing (@@ read this @@ Moher and Song 2019🡪 Palluel-Germain, Boy, Orliaguet, & Coello, 2004 @@) and place constraints on the subjects movement (@@ Make sure it appears in these papers @@ Moher and Song 2019🡪 Desmurget, Jordan, Prablanc, & Jeannerod, 1997; Desmurget, Prablanc, Jordan, & Jeannerod, 1997; Palluel-Germain, Boy, Oliaguet, & Coello, 2004) and inhibit process which might be of interest to us from being expressed in the motion.

Indeed, when comparing it to reaching for an answer in the real world, reaching has been shown to have faster movement times, larger movement curvetures (@@ Read abstract and discussion to check if relevant @@ "larger curvature represents uncertainty about predicted target position" Reaching for known unknowns: Rapid reach decisions accurately reflect the future state of dynamic probabilistic information), faster velocities and most importantly to respond faster to changes of mind, which makes it optimal for detecting fast / short lasting processes such as unconscious priming effects. Even more importantly, it has been shown that changes of mind are less likely to occur when a motor demand of a task is higher (@@ Read this @@ Moher and Song 2019🡪 Burk, Ingram, Franklin, Shadlen, &Wolpert, 2014; Moher&Song, 2014), this means incongruent effects might occur less frequently.

In the current research we will compare two measures of unconscious processing: response time given via a keyboard and reaching area derived from 3D motion tracking of reaching movements. Subjects will perform a semantic categorization task (does the target describe an "natural" / "artificial" item) in which the target word will be preceded by an unconscious prime that can be congruent / incongruent to the target's category. Next, the subject will be asked to recognize the prime in a two forced choices task, and finally they will rate the prime's visibility in a PAS scale (from 1 for "Didn't see anything" to 4 for "Saw the prime clearly"). The experiment will be comprised of two sessions in two consecutive days. The first day includes only a training session without primes and its purpose is to allow subjects to hasten their responses in the reaching task while keeping their accuracy high.

A different test group will be used for each measure to avoid a practice effect.

@@ When writing your thesis @@ @@ Explain about our pilot studies, how did we start, what did we change in each one and why, how does it help us produce greater effects @@

### Hypothesis

In-line with previous comparisons between motion tracking and keyboard responses, we expect motion tracking to detect a greater incongruency effect (when comparing the effect size of both measures).

## Methods

### Design

IV:

1. Congruency: A within subject variable of two levels:
   1. Congruent: prime and target are the same word.
   2. Incongruent: Prime and target are from a different semantic category and do not share letters in common locations.
2. Item type: A within subject variable of two levels:
   1. Natural: target and / or prime represent a natural item (e.g. "Plant", "Cloud").
   2. Artificial: target and / or prime represent an artificial product (e.g. "Radio", "Phone").
3. Response measure: A between subject variable of two levels:
   1. Motion tracking: Subjects choose the correct answer on by reaching and touching it on the screen.
   2. Key press response: Subjects choose the answer on the left / right half of the screen by pressing "F" / "J" accordingly.

DP:

1. Area under the curve (AUC): Area between the actual trajectory and the optimal path (a straight line connecting the start and end points). Area central to the optimal path is considered positive, while area lateral to it is considered negative. The area is evaluated for each trial separately.
2. Reach area: Area between the average path to a left target and an average path to a right target in a single condition (congruent / incongruent). Path is averaged across trials in a single condition.
3. Response time: The time it takes a subject to categorize the target as natural / artificial, measured from target display until keyboard response.

### Planned sample

All subjects will be right-handed, native Hebrew speakers who aren't color blind have normal or corrected-to-normal vision using contact lenses (the reflection on glasses could create problems with the motion tracking system). Only subjects declaring that they have no neurological, attentional, or mental disorders, and not taking psychiatric medicines, will be included.

Data will be collected at Prof. Liad Mudrik's lab of high cognition in Tel-Aviv University, from students or other young adults at the ages of 18-35, in two session on two consecutive days, the first lasting 30 minutes and the second lasting 90 minutes.

Subjects will be reimbursed with course credit or cash payment.

### Sample size estimation

#### Non-parametric sample size estimation

To estimate the required sample size for receiving a power of 0.8 we used resampling of the data.

We sampled with replacement *n* subjects out of the *N* = 20 available subjects from the pilot study, and calculated the effect size and *p-value* on that sample. This was done 104 times for each sample size from 1 to 20, and the percent of significant *p-values* was computed for each sample size. This estimate was used as power.

#### Parametric power estimation

### Exclusion criteria

@@ Add exclusion criteria after adding the keyboard experiment @@

The following trials will be excluded:

1. Trials in which there was a technical malfunction with the setup or recording:
   1. Over 100ms of missing samples in the trajectory.
   2. Less than 100ms of existing samples in the trajectory.
   3. Stimuli presentation time deviated from desired duration by more than 2ms.
2. Trials in which the subject provided a problematic response:
   1. Short reach distance: the reach on the *Z* axis is shorter than the distance between the starting point and the screen minus the finger size.
   2. Missed both targets: touch point is outside a 12cm radius circle surrounding each target laying flat on the screen.
   3. Moved too early (less than 100ms after target display, implying a planned response), too late (more than 320ms after target was displayed) or too slow (time to reach the screen from movement onset was longer than 420ms).
   4. Wrong answer in categorizing the target. Cognitive processes on correct and incorrect answers may be different. @@ Find a citation for this or ask Craig @@

The following subjects will be excluded:

During data collection:

1. Who failed to response within the time constraints on at least 30% of the trails on the training day. This implies the subject won't be able to handle the required response times on the test day, and thus he will be disqualified. @@ Add this criterion to the consent form and to the analysis (Put a threshold of 30% in code) (Insert the checkDay1 to the tests or something to make sure you run it after every subjects) @@

After data collection:

1. Who has less than 30 valid (that weren't excluded) trials in each level of the congruency IV.
2. Who's answer at categorizing the target are found to be at chance level in a binomial test.
3. Who's answer at recognizing the prime are found to be better than chance level in a binomial test.