**Methods**

To investigate if episodic memory lead to more risk-seeking in gains, we designed an experiment where participants were required to make choices from experience in a simple gambling task (Madan & al., 2014). In Experiment 1, participants were either briefly trained in recollecting details of a video or had to describe general information about the same videos. (Jing, Madore, & Schacter, 2016; Madore, Szpunar, Addis, & Schacter, 2016; Madore, Addis & Schacter, 2015; Madore et Schacter, 2014). Experiment 2 served as a control study, in which participants performed the gambling task without any prior video or induction.

*Experiment 1*

The Experiment 1 was initially conducted as a within-subject design, with every participant undergoing the following procedure twice. Due to the presence of carryover effects between across the two sessions, below we report only the results from the first session of the experiment.

*Participants*

This study was approved by McGill’s Research Ethics Office (REB) and participants were recruited through McGill’s classified ads system, and

*Episodic specificity induction*

The experimental procedure began with an episodic specificity or control (“general”) induction, following the procedure of Madore et al. (2014). The episodic specificity induction is an experimental manipulation that has been inspired by the Cognitive interview, which has been shown to enhance the number of accurate details eyewitnesses can recall about events (Memon, Meissner, & Fraser, 2010). The participants first watched a 4-minutes long videos of “Mr.Bean” and were told to pay close attention to it since questions would be asked afterward.

At the end of the video, participants were interviewed and asked different questions depending on whether they were randomly assigned to the episodic or control (‘’general impressions’’) condition (Jing, Madore, & Schacter, 2016; Madore, Szpunar, Addis, & Schacter, 2016; Madore, Addis & Schacter, 2015; Madore et Schacter, 2014). In the Episodic condition, participants were first asked to describe as many specific details as they could remember about the surroundings. They were then asked to do the same about the physical appearances of the participants in the scene. Finally, they were asked to describe the actions in the video in chronological and in as much detail as they could remember. In the Control (“General Impressions”) condition, participants used adjectives to describe the setting/people/actions as well as general questions about the video to broad questions about the video.

*Gambling task*

The gambling task used was inspired from Madan et al. (2014). On each of 100 trials, participants chose between two doors which both yielded real-monetary rewards. After choosing a door, participants were shown the reward they received from that door. Participants were not told beforehand the possible outcomes associated with each door; they had to learn the task from their own experience. One of the doors was safe and always yielded a reward of 1.25 cents, while the other door was designated as the “risky” door and had a 50% chance to give 2.5 cents and a 50% chance to yield nothing. Participants performed 100 trials of the gambling task per session.

Previous studies using similar gambling tasks reveal that initial outcomes carry a disproportionately large influence on further decisions (Shteingart et al., 2013). In this experiment, each participant received an equal amount of good and bad outcomes when choosing the gamble for the first four times. Accordingly, we controlled the first four outcomes participants obtained when choosing the risky door: They received one of the following patterns: win-loss-win-loss (the “first-win” condition) or loss-win-loss-win (the “first-loss” condition). Since we suspected the second, third and fourth first outcomes might also strongly affect participants’ risk preferences, the first outcome manipulation allowed us to systematically evaluate the impact of the very first outcome on risk preferences.

*Memory Recall*

We assessed participants’ memories right after the choice task by asking them what was the first outcome that came to their mind when thinking about the risky door, following the procedure from Madan et al. (2014). This allowed to see whether the experimental manipulations influence participants’ memories of the outcomes they received in the task, and if the memory of the outcomes guided behavior.

Immediately following the recall task, participants were asked to draw the two doors to the best they could remember. These drawings were scored on a scale from 0 to 12. One point was assigned per side, color, frame, window, knob and background of each door that was drawn correctly. Points of 0.5 were assigned if the drawing of an aspect was relevant but only partially accurate. The rater was blind to the condition of the participant.

At the very beginning of the experiment, we assessed participants moods with the Positive and Negative Affect Scale (Watson et al., 1988).

*Data Analysis*

All analyses here were performed using the R programming language. Mixed-effects logistic regressions were performed using the lme4 package (Pinheiro & Bates, 2000) in the R programming language.

*Experiment 2*

Experiment 2 was comprised of a single “control” condition in which participants completed the gambling task without any prior induction or video. The gambling task and memory recall procedure was identical to that of Experiment 1 except that they were performed in the absence of an episodic or general impressions induction.