

Open Practices Disclosure

Manuscript Title: Using Large Language Model Based AI Suspects to Train Strategic Use of Evidence: Evidence of Transfer

Author Names (in order of authorship): Siyu Li, Pär-Anders Granhag, Yunhan Shi, Yongjie Sun, Thomas J. Nyman, Shumpei Haginoya, and Pekka Santtila

Corresponding Author: Pekka Santtila

Articles are eligible to earn badges that recognize open scientific practices: publicly available data, material, or preregistered research plans. You can read more about the badges on the Open Science Framework [wiki](#).

To apply for one or more badges acknowledging open practices, please check the box(es) corresponding to the desired badge(s) below and provide the information requested in the relevant sections. To qualify for a badge, you **must** provide a URL, doi, or other permanent path for accessing the specified information in a public, open-access repository, and the specified information must be provided in a format that is time-stamped, immutable, and permanent. **Qualifying public, open-access repositories are committed to preserving data, materials, and/or registered analysis plans and keeping them publicly accessible via the web in perpetuity.** Examples include the Open Science Framework ([OSF](#)) and the various Dataverse networks. Hundreds of other qualifying data/materials repositories are listed at <http://re3data.org/>. Preregistration of an analysis plan must take place via a publicly accessible registry system (e.g., [OSF](#), [ClinicalTrials.gov](#) or other trial registries in the [WHO Registry Network](#), institutional registration systems). **Personal websites and most departmental websites do not qualify as repositories.**

Authors who wish to publicly post third-party material in their data, materials, or preregistration plan must have the proper authority or permission agreement in order to do so.

There are circumstances in which it is not possible or advisable to share any or all data, materials, or a research plan publicly. For example, there are cases in which sharing participants' data could violate confidentiality. If you would like your article to include an explanation of such circumstances and/or provide links to any data or materials you have made available—even if not under conditions eligible to earn a badge—you may write an alternative note that will be published in a note in the article. Please check this box if you would like your article to include an alternative note and provide the text of the note below:

☐ **Alternative note:**

■ Open Data Badge

Provide the URL, doi, or other **permanent path** for accessing the time-stamped and immutable data in a **public, open-access repository**:

<https://osf.io/u7ekj/> Please refer to the file named “Data”.

- Confirm that there is sufficient information for an independent researcher to reproduce **all of the reported results**, including codebook if relevant.

<https://osf.io/u7ekj/> Please refer to the file named “Statistical Analyses”.

■ Open Materials Badge

Provide the URL, doi, or other **permanent path** for accessing the time-stamped and immutable materials in a **public, open-access repository**:

<https://osf.io/u7ekj/> Please refer to the file named “Supplemental Materials”.

- Confirm that there is sufficient information for an independent researcher to reproduce **all of the reported methodology**.

<https://osf.io/u7ekj/> Please refer to the file named “Supplemental Materials”.

■ Preregistered Badge

1. Provide the URL, doi, or other **permanent path** to the time-stamped and immutable registration in a **public, open-access repository***:

https://aspredicted.org/K4D_KGN The link provided is from AsPredicted, which allows for a single link that can be either anonymous or public. Currently, it is set to anonymous for review purposes.

2. Was the analysis plan registered prior to examination of the data or observing the outcomes? If no, explain.**

Yes. The analysis plan was registered prior to to examination of the data and observing the outcome.

3. Were there additional registrations for the study other than the one reported? If yes, provide links and explain.*

No.

4. Were there any changes to the preregistered analysis plan for the primary confirmatory analysis? If yes, explain**

Yes. After data collection, additional analyses were conducted. First, we examined the impact of interventions on the use of free-recall questions, as presenting free-recall questions at the beginning of the interview is an important tactic within the Strategic Use of Evidence (SUE) framework. Second, we analyzed the impact of interventions on the number of evidence-statement and within-statement inconsistencies produced by Human Mock Suspects (originally, we only planned analyses for interviewers’ reported evidence-statement and within-statement (in)consistencies). These analyses were added to enable a more direct comparison with previous studies and to provide a more comprehensive understanding of evidence-statement and within-statement (in)consistencies. Finally,

we also explored the impact of interventions on interviewers' deception bias. The first and third additional analyses were not incorporated into the hypotheses section. The hypotheses concerning the number of evidence-statement and within-statement inconsistencies (Hypotheses 2 and 3) were formulated prior to observing the results.

5. Are all of the analyses described in the registered plan reported in the article? If no, explain.*

No. We reported all primary analyses in the main manuscript. Secondary analyses are available in the Supplemental Materials: Additional Results 1 and 2. The results related to Working Memory Capacity (WMC) were not included in this manuscript for two reasons: (1) including these results may divert focus from the main research question, and (2) we intend to explore these data in future research.

*No badge will be awarded if (1) is not provided, **or** if (3) is answered "yes" without strong justification, **or** if (5) is answered "no" without strong justification.

**If the answer to (2) is "no," the notation DE (Data Exist) will be added to the badge, indicating that registration postdates realization of the outcomes but predates analysis. If the answer to (4) is "yes" with strong justification for changes, the notation TC (Transparent Changes) will be added to the badge, indicating that the analysis plan was altered but the preregistered analyses and rationale for the change are provided.

By signing below, authors affirm that the above information is accurate and complete, that any third-party material has been reproduced or otherwise made available only with the permission of the original author or copyright holder, and that publicly posted data do not contain information that would allow individuals to be identified without consent.

Signature:

Siyu Li