**Supplemental Materials and Methods**

*Task design*

During threat conditioning, two colored squares were presented for 4 s on each trial, one of which was paired with a mild electric shock in 43% of the trials (CS+) while the other was never paired with a shock (CS-). On day 2 (extinction) and day 3 (re-extinction) no shocks were delivered but the stimulating bar electrodes were connected to the participant’s non-dominant wrist. Extinction and re-extinction started with a CS- presentation and therefore involved one additional CS- trial; subsequent presentations of CS+ and CS- were counterbalanced.

*Skin conductance measurement*

Skin conductance response (SCR) was measured throughout with Ag-AgCl electrodes, filled with standard NaCl electrolyte gel, and attached to the middle phalanges of the second and third fingers of the non-dominant hand. SCR signal was amplified and recorded with a MP150 BIOPAC Systems skin conductance module connected to a PC. Data were continuously recorded at a rate of 200 samples per second and analyzed with a model-based approach (Bach *et al.*, 2010) using MATLAB R2015b (The Mathworks Inc, Natick, MA, USA). Shocks were delivered using a Grass Medical Instruments SD9 stimulator and stimulating bar electrodes attached to the participant’s non-dominant wrist. Shock intensity was calibrated up to a maximum of 60V to reach a level described by participants as "uncomfortable, but not painful".

*Analysis of skin conductance response*

The outcome measure was the psychophysiological arousal response to the CS, indexed by the estimated anticipatory sudomotor nerve activity (aSNA) amplitude (Bach *et al.*, 2010). Estimates of aSNA indicate the anticipation of an aversive event within the time window of stimulus presentation. These were calculated by inverting a forward model that describes how (hidden) SNA translates into an (observable) SCR using a variational Bayes approximation. A unit increase in aSNA corresponds to an increase in SCR of 1 μ S. This method uses summary statistics across all available trials to demonstrate successful experimental manipulations such as threat conditioning, and has shown to be more sensitive compared to a conventional SCR peak-to-peak analysis (Bach, 2014; Bach *et al.*, 2010, 2015; Staib *et al.*, 2015).
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