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**Appendix: Supplemental Experiment** (see Footnote 4)

**Method**

*Participants.*  47 UNSW undergraduates participated in exchange for course credit (mean age=19.85 years; 35 female, 12 male). All participants gave informed consent and the experiment was approved by the UNSW Human Research Ethics Approval Panel.

*Materials and Procedure.* The materials and procedure were the same as those used in Experiment 1, except that lag-4 trials were replaced with lag-8 trials (i.e., targets were presented at either lag-2 or lag-8). Participants did not complete questionnaires.

**Results**

A 2 (Forewarning: Warning Present vs Warning Absent) X 2 (Lag: 2 vs 8) X 2 (Distractor Type: Negative vs Erotic) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Forewarning, *F*(1,46) = 14.316, *p* < .001, ηp2= 0.237, with better performance in warning-present, compared to warning-absent, trials. There was also a significant main effect of Lag, *F*(1,46) = 262.224, *p* < .001, ηp2= 0.851, with better performance at lag-8 than lag-2. The main effect of Distractor Type was also significant, *F*(1,46) = 4.356, *p* = .042, ηp2= 0.087; erotic distractors impaired performance more than negative distractors. Consistent with our hypothesis, there was a significant Forewarning X Lag interaction, *F*(1,46) = 8.444, *p* = .006, ηp2= 0.155, with a greater benefit of forewarning at lag-2 compared to lag-8. All other 2-way interactions, and the 3-way interaction between factors, were non-significant (*Fs*<1).At lag-2, target accuracy was better in warning-present compared to warning-absent trials in both negative (warning present: *M=*74.7%, *SD=*11.3%; warning absent: *M=*70.1%, *SD=*12.9%, *t*(46) =2.438, *p*=.019, *dz=*0.356) and erotic (warning present: *M=*72.9%, *SD=*12.1%; warning absent: *M=*67.5%, *SD=*10.9%, *t*(46) =2.779, *p* = .008, *dz=*0.405) conditions. Warnings did not improve performance at lag-8 in either the negative (warning present: *M=*91.2%, *SD=*5.8%; warning absent: *M=*90.2%, *SD=*6.8%, *t*(46) =1.038, *p*= .305, *dz=*0.151), or erotic conditions (warning present: *M=*90.0%, *SD=*8.2%; warning absent: *M=*89.4%, *SD=*7.8%, *t*(46) =0.535, *p*=.595, *dz=*0.078). Compared to baseline performance (*M*=89.7, *SD*=4.4), performance in all lag-2 conditions was impaired (*ps*<.001), but performance in all lag-8 conditions were no different than baseline performance (*ps*>.05).