Supplemental Results for “Dissecting decision-making in depression”
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*Figure S1.* Signal detection results from Study 1. Analysis of (A) response bias and (B) discriminability returned only a trend (*p* = 0.06) for a negative effect of MDD on discriminability.
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*Figure S2*. HDDM parameters explain PRT variables in Study 1. Zero-order correlations between (A) response bias in the PRT and starting point bias from the HDDM (*r* = 0.55, *p* < 0.001), and (B) discriminability in the PRT and drift rate from the HDDM (*r* = 0.92, *p* < 0.001).
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*Figure S3*. HDDM parameters explain PRT variables in Study 2. Zero-order correlations between: (A) response bias in the PRT and starting point bias from the HDDM (*r* = 0.40, *p* = 0.005); and (B) discriminability in the PRT and drift rate from the HDDM (*r* = 0.89, *p* < 0.001).
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*Figure S4*. Psychometric results: Study 1. Internal consistency, as measured by split-half reliability and expressed using the Spearman-Brown (SB) prophecy, in Study 1. Each dot represents the results from odd trials (y-axis) and even trials (x-axis) in a single participant.
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*Figure S5*. Psychometric results: Study 2. Internal consistency, as measured by split-half reliability and expressed using the Spearman-Brown (SB) prophecy, in Study 2. Each dot represents the results from odd trials (y-axis) and even trials (x-axis) in a single participant.