

Supplementary Information

Supplementary Table 1

Participants Disqualification Criteria

Experiment	Go cue	Sample Size (Excluded)	Number of Disqualified Participants
Exp. 1: Snacks	Auditory	19 (12)	9 - Training ^a 3 - Apparatus ^b
Exp. 2: Fractals	Auditory	25 (3)	2 - Apparatus 1 - Intransitive ranking
Exp. 3: Positive IAPS	Auditory	27 (0)	
Exp. 4: Negative IAPS	Auditory	28 (5)	1 - Participant requested to stop 4 - Training
Exp. 5: Snacks	Visual	25 (1)	1 - Training ^a
Exp. 6: Snacks	Auditory Aversive	25 (4)	3 - Apparatus 1 - Avoided probe choices of low-value items
Exp. 7: Faces	Auditory	25 (1)	1 - Training
Exp. 8: Fractals	Auditory	25 (2)	1- Apparatus 1- Training
Exp. 9: Positive IAPS	Visual	29 (3)	1 - Participant requested to stop 2 - Training
Exp. 10: Negative IAPS	Visual	27 (3)	3 - Training

Note. A total of 35 participants were disqualified from analysis due to reasons mentioned above.

^aThe most common cause of disqualification was behavior during training. Participant that during training phase stopped responding to the Go cue for prolonged periods of time. This exclusion criteria was adopted from previous cue-approach published work ^{11,12}. In Experiment 1, this criterion was applied post-hoc, which resulted in a relatively smaller number of participants.

^b Another frequent reason for disqualification was due to technical problems with the apparatus running the experiment.

a.		b.		c.		d.	
Sorted	Items	Pairs		Sorted	Items	Pairs	
Rankings		High Go	High No-Go	Rankings		High Go	High No-Go
.98	1	7	8	.98	1	7	8
.95	.	10	9	.95	.	10	9
.89	.	12	11	.89	.	12	11
.	7	13	14	.	7	13	14
.	.	15	16	.	.	15	16
.	.	18	17	.	.	18	17
.	.	20	19	.	18	18	17
.	22	21	22	.	.	Low Go	Low No-Go
.	.			.	.	44	43
.	.	Low Go	Low No-Go	.	.	45	14
.	39	39	40	.	.	47	16
.	.	42	41	.	43	50	17
.	.	44	43	.	.	52	19
.	.	45	14	.	.	53	22
.	54	47	16	.	54		
.12	.	50	17	.12	.		
.09	.	52	19	.09	.		
.03	60	53	22	.03	60		

Supplementary Figure 1. Sorting and pair matching procedure.

1a. In the first experimental design (used in Experiments 1-4), items were rank ordered based on initial preferences evaluation procedure, and classified as high-value (ranks 7:22) and low-value items (39:54). 1b. Eight high and eight low-value items were associated with the cue and response during training (assigned to be Go items). In the probe phase, all eight Go items were paired with similar-value No-Go items, forming 64 (8×8) unique pairs in each value category. 1c. In a second experimental design (used in Experiments 5-10) similar rank ordering was conducted. Items were classified as high-value (7:18) and low-value items (43:54). 1d. Six high-value and six low-value items assigned to be Go items during training. In the probe phase, all six Go items were paired with similar initial value No-Go items, forming 36 (6×6) unique pairs in each value category. Condition assignments for Go and No-Go items were counterbalanced across participants in both experimental designs.

```
%% Neutral auditory cue
% features:
wave = sin(1:0.25:1000);
freq = 22254;

% Play the sound
sound(wave, freq);

%% Aversive auditory cue
% features:
wave = cot(1:0.25:7541);
freq = 100544;

% Play the sound
sound(wave, freq);
```

Supplementary Code. Neutral and aversive auditory cues, implemented in MATLAB.

In Experiments 1-4 and 7-8 a neutral auditory cue of 180-ms was produced using a sinus wave function. To induce aversive auditory cue in Experiment 6, a longer duration of 300-ms cotangent wave function was used.