**Supplementary materials**

**Part 1**

**Supplementary Table 1**

Skewness and Kurtosis for SPQ total score and factor scores for each group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | HC group | | Schizotypy group | | |
|  | Skewness | Kurtosis | Skewness | | Kurtosis |
| Total SPQ score | -0.188 | -0.997 | -0.160 | | -0.302 |
| Cognitive-Perceptual | 0.053 | -1.055 | -0.135 | 0.526 | |
| Interpersonal | 0.319 | -0.861 | 0.303 | | -0.577 |
| Disorganized | 0.658 | -0.062 | -0.940 | | 0.141 |

Note: HC: healthy control.

**Part 2**

1. **The normality test results of data**

K-S normality test was used to examine whether the distribution of the current data has a significant difference with normal distribution. If the *p* value is greater than 0.05, it is considered that the distribution of the current data is not significantly different from normal distribution, i.e., the data can be seemed as approximately normally distributed.

**The accuracy data**

For the HC group, the *p* values for incongruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.09 and 0.135, respectively. The *p* values for congruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.012 and 0.001, respectively.

For the schizotypy group, the *p* values for the incongruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.200 and 0.200, respectively. The *p* values for the congruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.000 and 0.002, respectively.

**The RT data**

For the HC group, the *p* values for the incongruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.133 and 0.200, respectively. The *p* values for the congruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.052 and 0.087, respectively.

For the schizotypy group, the *p* values for the incongruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.200 and 0.200, respectively. The *p* values for the congruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.200 and 0.200, respectively.

**The MFN amplitude**

For the HC group, the *p* values for the incongruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.200 and 0.200, respectively. The *p* values for the congruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.200 and 0.267, respectively.

For the schizotypy group, the *p* values for the incongruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.200 and 0.077, respectively. The *p* values for the congruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.200 and 0.041, respectively.

**The conflict SP amplitude**

For the HC group, the *p* values for the incongruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.069 and 0.035, respectively. The *p* values for the congruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.081 and 0.032, respectively.

For the schizotypy group, the *p* values for the incongruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.200 and 0.142, respectively. The *p* values for the congruent trials under the MC and MI contexts were 0.080 and 0.107, respectively.

From the above results, it can be found that most of the data were normally distributed. We have used several transformation methods (including square root, ln, log10 and reciprocal) and found that they could not make the data of a single variable normally distributed in all conditions. Moreover, we conducted analyses on the transformed data (even they were not normally distributed) and found that the general pattern of results was the same as the results analyzed based on the original data. Given that Harwell et al. (1992) and Zinke et al. (2010) suggested that the results of ANOVA are robust and show excellent power properties even the assumptions are violated, we still presented the results of analyses on the original data in the manuscript.

1. **The results of homogeneity of variance test**

The Levene’s test was used to examine equality of variances.

**MC context**

***The accuracy data***

The *p* values between schizotypy and HC groups for the incongruent trials and congruent trials were 0.917 and 0.900, respectively.

***The RT data***

The *p* values between schizotypy and HC groups for the incongruent trials and congruent trials were 0.375 and 0.948, respectively.

***The MFN amplitude***

The *p* values between schizotypy and HC groups for the incongruent trials and congruent trials were 0.380 and 0.920, respectively.

***The conflict SP amplitude***

The *p* values between schizotypy and HC groups for the incongruent trials and congruent trials were 0.224 and 0.104, respectively.

**MI context**

***The accuracy data***

The *p* values between schizotypy and HC groups for the incongruent trials and congruent trials were 0.170 and 0.891, respectively.

***The RT data***

The *p* values between schizotypy and HC groups for the incongruent trials and congruent trials were 0.533 and 0.260, respectively.

***The MFN amplitude***

The *p* values between schizotypy and HC groups for the incongruent trials and congruent trials were 0.369 and 0.313, respectively.

***The conflict SP amplitude***

The *p* values between schizotypy and HC groups for the incongruent trials and congruent trials were 0.098 and 0.386, respectively.

From the above results, we can see that the variance of healthy controls and individuals with schizotypy is homogeneous.
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