

1 **Do task-irrelevant cross-modal statistical regularities induce distractor**
2 **suppression in visual search?**

3 Kishore Kumar Jagini^{1*} and Meera Mary Sunny¹

4 ¹Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, Gandhinagar, India

7
8 ***Corresponding Author:**

9 Kishore Kumar Jagini,
10 AB5/316, Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar
11 Gandhinagar – 382355Gujarat, India
12 Email: kishore.jagini@iitgn.ac.in

13
14 **Type of Manuscript:** Registered report – Stage 1 Proposal

15
16 **Conflict of Interest Statement:**

17 The authors declare that the proposed study is without any commercial or other conflicts
18 of interest.

19
20 **Ethics approval statement:**

21 The experimental procedures have been approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee
22 (IEC) of Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, Gandhinagar, India

23
24 **Data availability:**

25 The authors confirm that the raw data and experimental/analysis code will be made
26 available to the public.

27
28 **Funding:**

29 The authors confirm that facilities and resources are available to complete the proposed
30 study.

Cross-modal statistical regularities and Visual selection

1 Dear Recommender/Editor, PCI RR

2 We wish to propose a stage-1 registered report titled: “**Do task-irrelevant cross-modal**
3 **statistical regularities induce distractor suppression in visual search?**”. Recently, the research
4 community has shown substantial interest in understanding how people learn and utilize distractor
5 regularities in visual search tasks to optimize search behaviour. For example, a recent seminal study by
6 Wang & Theeuwes (2018) showed that salient visual distractors are perceptually suppressed when they
7 frequently appear at a particular spatial location in visual search displays to facilitate the visual search
8 task performance. This evidence indicates that participants, based on distractor spatial statistical
9 regularities, can anticipate the likely location of distractors in visual search and perceptually suppress
10 them for task efficiency.

11
12 This registered report proposes to test a question that addresses whether the study participants learn to
13 utilize task-irrelevant, cross-modal stimulus spatial (Experiment 1) and non-spatial regularities
14 (Experiment 2) indicating the salient visual distractor’s likely location in search displays to perceptually
15 suppress them for optimizing task efficiency. It would provide evidence that the visuospatial attentional
16 priority map can flexibly be modified based on the learning of task-irrelevant, cross-modal stimulus
17 statistical regularities.

18
19 We confirm that sufficient funding and facilities are available to complete the proposed study
20 successfully. The experimental procedures involved in this study are already approved by the
21 Institutional Ethics Committee (IEC) of the Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, India. We
22 expect to complete the proposed study within three months of study approval. After completing data
23 collection, we will analyze the data and write the manuscript within one to two months. We agree that
24 the raw data and experimental/analysis code will be made available to the public. Following Stage-1 in-
25 principle acceptance, we agree to register the approved protocol on the Open Science Framework or
26 any other recognized repository either publicly or under private embargo until Stage-2 manuscript
27 submission. We also agree that if the paper is retracted for any reason, a summary of the proposed pre-
28 registered study will be made available to publish if required.

29
30 Sincerely,
31 (On behalf of authors)
32 Kishore Kumar Jagini
33 Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, India.

1 **Abstract:**

2

3 We are constantly bombarded with a vast number of multisensory stimuli in our daily lives.
4 Our sensory systems are known to extract and utilize statistical regularities in the sensory inputs
5 across space and time to optimize the attentional orienting in the multisensory environment.
6 This registered report proposes to test a question that addresses whether participants learn to
7 utilize task-irrelevant, cross-modal stimulus spatial (Experiment 1) and non-spatial regularities
8 (Experiment 2) indicating the salient visual distractor's likely location (color singleton
9 distractor) in search displays to perceptually suppress them for optimizing task efficiency.
10 Critically, the spatial location of a colour singleton distractor in each trial could be either
11 predicted or unpredicted based on the task-irrelevant auditory statistical regularities
12 simultaneously presented across search displays. If the auditory statistical regularities induce
13 visual distractor location suppression, it would provide evidence that the visuospatial
14 attentional priority map can flexibly be modified based on the learning of task-irrelevant, cross-
15 modal stimulus statistical regularities. We also test participants' awareness about the statistical
16 regularities to determine whether the learning is implicit or not.

17

18

19 **Keywords:**

20 attention, attention capture, distractor suppression, cross-modal, statistical regularities

21

22

23

1 **Introduction**

2 Our senses are bombarded with a vast number of sensory stimuli, at any given moment,
3 from the external world and our body. In order to efficiently manage metabolic resources, our
4 brain prioritizes the task or goal-relevant sensory information and ignore the task-irrelevant
5 information. The set of processes involved in this optimization is referred to as selective
6 attention. Prominent theories of selective attention have proposed that the selection of
7 information in the environment is mainly dependent on two types of processes: top-down (aka
8 goal dependent) and bottom-up (aka stimulus-dependent) processes (Egeth & Yantis, 1997;
9 Theeuwes, 2010a). Recently, numerous empirical studies have indicated various cognitive
10 factors that can neither be categorized into top-down goals nor bottom-up processes that
11 determine attentional selectivity (Awh et al., 2012; Theeuwes & Failing, 2020). Many of these
12 cognitive factors are collectively referred to as “history-driven” influences on selective
13 attention (Theeuwes & Failing, 2020). They hypothesized that top-down, bottom-up, and
14 history-driven signals are projected onto a feature map representing selection priority to
15 determine the selective behaviour of organisms (Theeuwes & Failing, 2020). Pertinent to this
16 paper, we focus on the role of statistical learning, a history-driven cognitive mechanism, in
17 attentional selection (Awh et al., 2012; Theeuwes & Failing, 2020; Wang & Theeuwes, 2018b).

18
19 Frost et al. (2015) defined statistical learning as the “extraction of distributional
20 properties from sensory input across time and space” (Frost et al., 2015). They suggested that
21 statistical learning is one of the critical cognitive processes in the perceptual processing of
22 sensory inputs (Frost et al., 2015). Multiple previous studies indicated that sensory systems
23 utilize the statistical regularities in the sensory input for efficient perceptual processing (for
24 review see, (Frost et al., 2019). For instance, targets (task-relevant) that frequently appear at a
25 particular spatial location in visual search displays are perceptually processed better than targets
26 at infrequent search locations (Awh et al., 2012; Chun & Jiang, 1998; Geng & Behrmann, 2002,
27 2005; Jiang et al., 2013). Whereas recent studies suggested that the salient distractors (task-
28 irrelevant) that frequently appear at a particular spatial location in visual search displays are
29 perceptually suppressed by showing their reduced interference in visual search task
30 performance (faster RTs) compared to distractors at infrequent search locations to enhance the
31 task efficiency (Duncan & Theeuwes, 2020; Failing, Feldmann-Wüstefeld, et al., 2019; Failing,
32 Wang, et al., 2019; Li & Theeuwes, 2020; Lin et al., 2020; Theeuwes et al., 2018; Wang, Samara,
33 et al., 2019; Wang & Theeuwes, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c). For example, Wang & Theeuwes
34 (2018a) adopted a well-established additional singleton visual search paradigm developed

1 initially by (Theeuwes, 1991, 1992) with few modifications in their study. In the classic
2 additional singleton visual search task, participants are asked to search for a shape singleton (a
3 diamond among circles or vice versa) while ignoring a colour singleton distractor. Typically, a
4 reduced visual search task performance (slower RTs) in colour singleton present trials compared
5 to colour singleton absent trials is considered evidence for selective attentional priority of
6 colour singleton distractor (Luck et al., 2020; Theeuwes, 1992, 2010b). In their study, Wang &
7 Theeuwes (2018a) have shown that if the salient colour-singleton distractor more frequently
8 appears at a particular spatial location in visual search displays, its interference in visual search
9 task performance is reduced (faster RTs) compared to distractors at infrequent search locations.
10 Thus, learning statistical regularities of distractor locations modulates attentional processes to
11 enhance task efficiency. Moreover, such distractor statistical regularities improved search
12 performance without the participants' awareness, suggesting that learning distractor regularities
13 is implicit and influences perception independent of top-down control (Duncan & Theeuwes,
14 2020; Wang & Theeuwes, 2018b, 2018c). However, in recent studies utilizing similar
15 probabilistic tasks, testing the awareness of statistical regularities with more sensitive measures
16 indicated the evidence of explicit knowledge of awareness (Giménez-Fernández et al., 2020;
17 Vadillo et al., 2020). These studies cast doubts on the implicit nature of learning distractor
18 statistical regularities in additional singleton tasks.

19

20 Further, studies also indicate that the learning of distractor statistical regularities can be
21 non-spatial and feature specific (Failing, Feldmann-Wüstefeld, et al., 2019; Stilwell et al., 2019).
22 For example, Stilwell et al. (2019) showed that distractor colours that appear in search displays
23 more frequently were suppressed efficiently compared with less frequent distractor colours
24 (Stilwell et al., 2019). Although the mechanisms of such distractor suppression are far from
25 clear, recent studies suggest that the experience of distractor statistical regularities induce
26 anticipatory or pro-active modulations in the first feedforward sweep of information processing
27 that de-prioritize the most probable distractor locations (Huang et al., 2021; Wang, Driel, et al.,
28 2019). Overall, there seems to be enough evidence to support the notion that our brain learns
29 and utilize statistical regularities of both task-relevant and task-irrelevant sensory stimuli for
30 optimizing behaviour.

31

32 While investigations of most previous research focused on understanding how statistical
33 learning of visual objects influences selective attention, fewer studies have investigated in
34 cross-modal contexts (Chen et al., 2020, 2021; Kawahara, 2007; Nabet et al., 2002). For

1 example, Chen et al. (2020) required their participants to search for a visual target in a task-
2 irrelevant tactile stimulus context. The spatial location of the visual search target in each trial
3 was either predictable or unpredictable based on statistical regularities of tactile stimuli
4 (stimulated on participant's fingertips) embedded in the experimental trials. The search RTs for
5 the visual target were faster in predictive compared to the un-predictive tactile context in their
6 experiment 2. This finding suggests that task-irrelevant, cross-modal stimulus context can be
7 processed and used to improve performance in a visual search task. Critically, the experimental
8 investigations in previous studies focussed on whether and how task-irrelevant, cross-modal
9 stimulus statistical regularities that are indicative of visual search target location influence task
10 performance. The current study will investigate whether and how task-irrelevant, cross-modal
11 stimulus statistical regularities indicative of salient visual distractor location influence task
12 performance. If so, it would imply that the attentional system can be flexibly modified based
13 on the task-irrelevant, cross-modal stimulus regularities irrespective of whether they indicate
14 target or distractor in a visual search task.

15

16 We have proposed two experiments in this study. The first experiment is designed to test
17 whether the study participants learn to utilize the task-irrelevant auditory spatial regularities,
18 simultaneously presented across search displays, indicating salient visual distractor's likely
19 location influence visual search task performance. The second study is designed to test whether
20 the task-irrelevant auditory non-spatial and frequency-based regularities, simultaneously
21 presented across search displays, indicating salient visual distractor's likely location influence
22 visual search task performance. We adopt the additional singleton visual search paradigm
23 developed initially by Theeuwes (1991, 1992) with few modifications. In the proposed
24 experiments, we manipulate statistical regularities of colour singleton distractor locations along
25 with auditory stimulus spatial (experiment 1) and non-spatial, frequency-based (experiment 2)
26 regularities synchronously presented across search displays (see methods section for more
27 details). Critically, the spatial location of a colour singleton distractor in each trial could be
28 either predicted or unpredicted based on the task-irrelevant auditory statistical regularities. For
29 testing awareness about the relationship between auditory and visual distractor location
30 regularities, we will use the confidence rating scale and ranking method, adapted with slight
31 modifications from the study by Vadillo et al. (2020). The confidence rating scale and ranking
32 methods are, arguably, more sensitive measures for testing awareness than dichotomous "Yes"
33 or "No" responses and/or indicating a particular location where participants believe that the
34 target/distractor appeared most frequently (Giménez-Fernández et al., 2020; Vadillo et al.,

1 2020). First, at the end of the experiment, each participant will have to indicate whether they
2 have noticed the relationship between auditory and visual distractor location regularities on a
3 scale of 1 to 6 (1= “Definitely not”; 6= “Definitely yes”). Second, participants will be asked to
4 rank three locations on the search display to indicate the high probability visual distractor for
5 each sound stimulus separately (See the methods section for more details). The first, second,
6 and third-ranked locations will be given a score of 3, 2, 1, respectively, and for other locations,
7 the score will be zero. We will assign these locations into five categories (0-4) depending on
8 their distance from the corresponding auditory stimuli that match the likely location of a salient
9 visual distractor that is “high-probability valid distractor location (HpValD)”. For each
10 participant, we will then combine the data of two sound stimulus conditions to calculate the
11 mean scores obtained by locations according to the five categories mentioned above (0-4). We
12 will then analyse the linear relationship between scores received by each location from its
13 distance from the actual HpValD location to test the awareness of audio-visual statistical
14 regularities.

15

16 **Hypothesis:**

17 We propose to test the hypothesis regarding whether and how task-irrelevant, cross-
18 modal stimulus statistical regularities indicating the salient visual distractor’s likely location in
19 search displays influence search task performance in terms of response times (RTs). The
20 graphical representation of hypotheses is presented in Figure 1. We also test participants’
21 awareness about the the relationship between auditory and visual distractor location regularities
22 for experiment 1 and 2.

23

24 **Hypothesis #1:** We hypothesize that if the study participants can learn to utilize auditory
25 stimulus statistical regularities to anticipate the likely location of a salient visual distractor
26 (colour singleton distractor) in search displays, the distractor locations indicated by the auditory
27 stimuli (valid distractor location trials) are perceptually suppressed by pro-active modulations
28 in the first sweep of information processing to optimize the search efficiency (Huang et al.,
29 2021; Wang, Driel, et al., 2019). The response times (RTs) are expected to be shorter for
30 conditions where auditory stimuli match the likely location of a salient visual distractor that is
31 “high-probability valid distractor location (HpValD)” compared to the condition where auditory
32 stimuli do not match the likely location of a salient visual distractor that is “high-probability
33 invalid distractor location (HpInValD)” condition.

34

1 **Hypothesis #2:** We hypothesise that if the participants are aware of the the relationship
2 between auditory and visual distractor location regularities, we expect that the score received
3 by each location linearly decreases from its distance from the actual HpValD location.

4

5 **Manipulation Checks:** We have included ND (“No Distractor”) with no sound stimuli trials
6 and LpD (“Low probability distractor locations”) with uninformative sound conditions as
7 manipulation checks. The former condition associated with the search trials having no salient
8 colour singleton and no sound stimulus — should produce faster search RTs compared to
9 HpValD and HpInValD conditions. While the later condition associated with the appearance
10 of the salient visual distractor in infrequent search locations having uninformative sound
11 stimulus — should produce slower search RTs compared to HpValD and HpInValD conditions.

12

13

1 Study Design Table:

2

Question	Hypotheses	Sampling Plan	Analysis Plan	Interpretation given different outcomes
Do task-irrelevant cross-modal (auditory) spatial regularities induce distractor suppression in visual search? (Experiment 1)	The response times (RTs) are expected to be shorter for HpValD — “high-probability valid distractor location” trials compared to the HpInValD — “high-probability invalid distractor location” trials.	<p>We aim to recruit a minimum of 121 participants (who meets the participant selection criteria) from the Indian Institute of Technology.</p> <p>Sample Size Justification: In a previous study that is similar to the current experiments, Failing et al. (2019) reported an effect size of $d = 0.602$ by taking a difference between colour-match and colour-mismatch trials at two high probability distractor locations. Relying on the effect size from the previous study at the face value for an a priori power analysis is not recommended, as this might lead to underpowered studies (Dienes, 2021; Perugini et al., 2014). To guard against the underpowered study, we determined the smallest effect size of interest as the lower limit of 80% confidence interval for the effect size by following the advice of Perugini et al. (2014).</p> <p>The determined effect size of interest is 0.332 (estimated using Shiny R web app: https://designingexperiments.shinyapps.io/ci_smd/). Conducting an a priori power analysis with effect size $d = 0.332$, given $\alpha = 0.02$ and $\text{power} \geq 90$, yields a minimum of 121 participants required for each proposed experiment in a two-tailed matched-sample t-test (calculated using G*Power 3.1). This sample size is considerably larger than the typical experiments conducted using the additional singleton tasks (an average of around 26 participants in (Failing, Feldmann-Wüstefeld, et al., 2019; Wang & Theeuwes, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c)).</p>	We will use paired t-test to compare experimental conditions of HpValD (“high-probability valid distractor location”) with HpInValD (“high-probability invalid distractor location”) conditions. Significance level – α set to 0.02, with $\text{power} > 0.90$.	If the RTs are significantly shorter for the HpValD condition than the HpInValD conditions, we claim the hypothesis 1. Otherwise, we will claim that the auditory spatial statistical regularities do not have influence on the distractor suppression in visual search tasks.

Deleted: 76

Deleted:

Deleted: bound

Deleted: limit

Deleted: By taking account of the limited time and resources that the authors have and able collect the maximum sample size of 80 ± 5 for each proposed experiment, we chose 60% lower-confidence interval limit of the effect size as the smallest effect size of interest. The 60% confidence interval implies a 20% risk that the true effect size might be lower than the lower-confidence interval limit (Perugini et al., 2014)...

Deleted: 424

Deleted: 424

Deleted:

Deleted: 76

Cross-modal statistical regularities and Visual selection

Do task-irrelevant cross-modal (auditory) non-spatial, frequency-based regularities induce distractor suppression in visual search? (Experiment 2)	The response times (RTs) are expected to be shorter for HpValD — “high-probability valid distractor location” trials compared to the HpInValD — “high-probability invalid distractor location” trials.	As above	As above	If the RTs are shorter for the HpValD condition than the HpInValD conditions, we claim the hypothesis 1. Otherwise, we will claim that the auditory non-spatial and frequency based statistical regularities do not have influence on the distractor suppression in visual search tasks.
Do participants have awareness about the relationship between the auditory (spatial) and visual distractor location regularities? (Experiment 1)	We hypothesize that if the participants are aware of the relationship between auditory and visual distractor locations, we expect that the score received by each location linearly decreases from its distance from the actual HpValD location.	Minimum of 75 participants. Sample Size Justification: Recent studies indicated that using a confidence rating scale and ranking methods are, arguably, more sensitive measures for testing awareness (Giménez-Fernández et al., 2020; Vadillo et al., 2020). Utilizing these sensitive measures to test awareness of statistical regularities in probabilistic cuing search tasks, the Vadillo et al. (2020) study indicated that participants are not unaware of the statistical regularities. Their study reported an effect size of Cohen's $h = 0.57$ for their meta-analysis of experiment 1 and 2. However, choosing the effect size from a previous study at the face value for an a priori power analysis is not recommended, as this leads to underpowered studies (Dienes, 2021; Perugini et al., 2014). To guard against the underpowered study, we determined the smallest effect size of interest as the lower limit of 80% confidence interval for the effect size by following the advice of Perugini et al. (2014). <u>The determined effect size of interest is 0.426 (estimated using Shiny R web app: https://designingexperiments.shinyapps.io/ci_smd/).</u> The effect size of $d = 0.426$ requires a minimum of 75 participants for each proposed experiment to get power $\geq 90\%$ with alpha set to 0.02 (calculated using G*Power 3.1) in a two-tailed matched-sample t-test.	We will use a linear mixed-effects model with random intercept for participants to predict a relationship between the scores received by each location from its distance from the HpValD location.	We will claim that the participants are aware of statistical regularities if the scores received by each location linearly decreases from its distance from the actual HpValD location. Otherwise, we will claim that participants are unaware of statistical regularities.
Do participants have	As above	As above	As above	As above

Deleted: 81

Deleted: [95% CI: 0.41, 0.74]

Deleted: bound

Deleted: limit

Deleted: The reported lower limit of the 95% confidence interval of the effect size in Vadillo et al. (2020) study is 0.41. ...


Deleted: 1

Deleted: 81

Cross-modal statistical regularities and Visual selection

awareness about the the relationship between auditory (non-spatial and frequency based) and visual distractor location regularities ? (Experiment 2)				
--	--	--	--	--

1



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Figure 1. Possible Experimental Outcomes. (1A) If the auditory statistical regularities induce suppression of the high probability valid distractor location processing, shorter RTs expected in HpValD compared to the HpInValD condition. (1B) If the auditory regularities did not affect the visual search behaviour, RTs are expected to be the same for HpValD and HpInValD conditions. ND (“No Distractor”) = Distractor absent trials; HpValD (High probability valid distractor location)- high probability distractor location indicated by auditory regularities; HpInValD (“High probability in-valid distractor location”)= high probability distractor location not-indicated by auditory regularities. LpD (“Low probability distractor locations”) = Low probability distractor locations with uninformative sound.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

Number of Participants:

Justification for the sample size to test the hypothesis #1: The sample size is determined based on an a priori power analysis. In a previous study that is similar to the current experiments, Failing et al. (2019) reported an effect size of $d = 0.602$ by taking a difference between colour-match and colour-mismatch trials at two high probability distractor locations. Relying on the effect size from the previous study at the face value for an a priori power analysis is not recommended, as this might lead to underpowered studies (Dienes, 2021; Perugini et al., 2014). Therefore, to guard against the underpowered study, we determined the smallest effect size of interest as the ~~lower limit of 80% confidence interval for~~ the effect size by following the advice of Perugini et al. (2014).

The determined effect size of interest is ~~0.332~~ (estimated using Shiny R web app: https://designingexperiments.shinyapps.io/ci_smd/). Conducting an a priori power analysis with effect size $d = 0.332$, given $\alpha = 0.02$ and $\text{power} \geq 90\%$, ~~in a two-tailed matched-sample t-test~~ yields a minimum of ~~121~~ participants required to test the hypothesis #1 for each proposed experiment (calculated using G*Power 3.1). This sample size is considerably larger than the typical experiments conducted using the additional singleton tasks (an average of around 26 participants in (Failing, Feldmann-Wüstefeld, et al., 2019; Wang & Theeuwes, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c)).

Justification for the sample size to test the hypothesis #2: The sample size is determined based on an a priori power analysis. Most previous studies utilized dichotomous “Yes” or “No” responses and/or indicating a particular location where participants believe that the target/distractor appeared most frequently to test awareness about statistical regularities and concluded that the statistical learning is unconscious (e.g., in studies by (Failing, Feldmann-Wüstefeld, et al., 2019; Wang & Theeuwes, 2018b)). However, recent studies indicated that using a confidence rating scale and ranking methods are, arguably, more sensitive measures for testing awareness (Giménez-Fernández et al., 2020; Vadillo et al., 2020). Utilizing these sensitive measures to test awareness of statistical regularities in probabilistic cuing search tasks, the Vadillo et al. (2020) study indicated that participants are not unaware of the statistical regularities. Their study reported an effect size of Cohen's $h = 0.57$ for their meta-analysis of

- Deleted: bound
- Deleted: limit
- Deleted: lower-bound limit of
- Deleted: By taking account of the limited time and resources that the authors have and able collect the maximum sample size of 80 ± 5 for each proposed experiment, we chose 60% lower-confidence interval limit of the effect size as the smallest effect size of interest. The 60% confidence interval implies a 20% risk that the true effect size might be lower than the lower-confidence interval limit (Perugini et al., 2014). ...
- Deleted: 424
- Deleted: 424
- Deleted:
- Deleted: 76
- Deleted: with
- Deleted: in a two-tailed matched-sample t-test

Deleted: [95% CI: 0.41, 0.74]

1 experiment 1 and 2. However, choosing the effect size from the previous study at the face value
 2 for an a priori power analysis is not recommended, as this leads to underpowered studies
 3 (Dienes, 2021; Perugini et al., 2014). To guard against the underpowered study, we **therefore**
 4 determined the smallest effect size of interest as the **lower limit of 80% confidence interval for**
 5 **the effect size by following the advice of Perugini et al. (2014).**

6
 7 **The determined effect size of interest is 0.426 (estimated using Shiny R web app:**
 8 **https://designingexperiments.shinyapps.io/ci_smd/).** Conducting an a priori power analysis
 9 with effect size of $d = 0.426$, given $\alpha = 0.02$ and power $\geq 90\%$, **in a two-tailed matched-**
 10 **sample t-test** yields a minimum of **75** participants required to test the hypothesis #2 for each
 11 proposed experiment (calculated using G*Power 3.1).

12
 13 The experimental procedures have been approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee (IEC)
 14 of the Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, Gandhinagar, India. We will conduct the
 15 experiment after obtaining written informed consent from the participants.

16
 17 **Participant selection criteria:**

18 Selected participants must report normal hearing and colour vision and normal or
 19 corrected to normal visual acuity with an age range from 18 to 35 years. Additionally, we will
 20 test whether the participants can discriminate the spatial location of sound (left and right) in
 21 experiment 1. In experiment 2, we will test whether participants can discriminate between two
 22 different sound frequencies (500Hz & 1000Hz). A short two-alternative forced choice, 20
 23 auditory-only trials will be presented to the participants to judge the sound location (e.g., Left
 24 or Right) or sound frequency (e.g., Low or High). Those participants who show a minimum of
 25 75% accuracy will be selected for participation in the experiment. Selected participants must
 26 provide informed consent before they participate in the study. The experimental procedures
 27 have been approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee (IEC) of the Indian Institute of
 28 Technology Gandhinagar, India.

29
 30 **Materials:**

31 The experiments will be conducted in a dim-lit room. All the experimental stimuli will
 32 be created and presented using MATLAB with Psychophysics Toolbox extensions (Brainard,
 33 1997). The visual stimuli will be shown on an LCD monitor screen with a black background.

Deleted: bound

Deleted: limit

Deleted: lower-bound limit of

Deleted: By taking account of the limited time and resources that the authors have and able collect the maximum sample size of 80 ± 5 for each proposed experiment, we chose 95% lower-confidence interval limit of the effect size as the smallest effect size of interest. The 95% confidence interval implies a 5% risk that the true effect size might be lower than the lower-confidence interval limit (Perugini et al., 2014).

Deleted: The reported lower limit of the 95% confidence interval of the effect size in Vadillo et al. (2020) study is 0.41.

Deleted: 1

Deleted: 81

Deleted: in a two-tailed matched-sample t-test

1 Figure 2 shows the schematic of a visual search display consisting of eight shapes (e.g., one
2 diamond and seven circles) presented on an imaginary circle with a radius of 4 degrees centred
3 at the white fixation cross (1×1 degree). Each unfilled shape (circle subtended with 1-degree
4 radius, diamond subtended with 2 × 2 degrees) contains an embedded grey line (0.3 × 1.5
5 degrees, RGB:127/127/127) oriented either horizontally or vertically. The colour of the shapes
6 in the search display will be red (RGB: 255/0/0) and green (RGB: 0/255/0). For example, the
7 displays contain one circle in red, and the remaining all shapes will be in green or vice versa
8 (50% probability). The auditory stimulus in experiment 1 will be a burst of white noise (50ms
9 duration) presented via speakers placed on the left and right sides of the LCD screen. In
10 experiment 2, auditory stimuli consist of two pure tones (50ms duration) with 500 Hz or 1000
11 Hz frequency presented via headphones. The sound level will be adjusted for each participant
12 according to their comfort at the beginning of the experiment and will be kept constant
13 throughout the experiment.

14
15
16

17 **Experiment 1:**

18 The experiment 1 is aimed to test whether the study participants learn to utilize the task-
19 irrelevant auditory spatial regularities, simultaneously presented across search displays,
20 indicating salient visual distractor's likely location influence visual search task performance.
21 We hypothesize that if the study participants can learn to anticipate the salient distractor
22 locations indicated by the auditory stimuli (valid distractor location trials), the valid distractor
23 locations would be perceptually suppressed according to the pro-active distractor suppression
24 account, thereby impairing the distractor interference in visual search tasks (Huang et al., 2021;
25 Wang, Driel, et al., 2019).

26

27 **Procedure and design for Experiment 1:**

28 Each trial starts with a fixation cross presented until the trial ends. 500ms after the
29 fixation cross onset, the visual search display is presented for 2000ms or until the participant
30 makes a response (<2000ms). The participants will be instructed to search for a shape singleton
31 in the displays. For example, participants will be asked to search for a diamond shape among
32 circles or vice versa and respond to the line segment's orientation embedded in the target. If the
33 orientation of the line segment is horizontal, the participant is required to press the "Z" key, and

1 if the line segment is vertical, the participant is required to press the “M” key as soon as possible.
2 Participants will be asked to press the response key quickly and accurately. The target (shape
3 singleton) will be present in all the trials, and the target can be either circle or diamond with
4 equal probability. A blank display with intertrial interval (ITI) will be randomly determined
5 between 500ms to 750ms. The timed-out responses will be considered incorrect responses. In
6 cases of incorrect responses and timed-out responses, feedback will be provided to the
7 participants with white text “Incorrect response” or “Timed-out”, respectively at the center of
8 the LCD screen for 1000ms. No feedback will be provided for the correct responses. Two
9 critical design factors are important in the experiment regarding the experimental manipulations
10 of the additional (color) singleton distractor and the auditory stimulus across the trials.

11

12 Additional singleton distractor and search target manipulations: All search elements will
13 be red or green with equal probability in one-sixth of the trials (“distractor absent trials”). In
14 the remaining trials, one of the distractors will have the same shape as other distractors but with
15 a unique color (red among green distractors or vice versa with equal probability). These trials
16 are labelled as additional singleton distractor present trials or simply “distractor present trials”.
17 The red or green additional singleton distractor could be present at any of the eight search
18 locations in distractor present trials. However, the additional singleton distractors are more
19 likely to appear in two search locations (31.25 % each) and less likely (6.25 %) in each of the
20 remaining six search locations in the search display. The high probability distractor locations
21 are positioned such that one of the high probability distractor locations is on the left hemifield
22 and the other is on the right hemifield with a maximum distance between them (i.e., they are at
23 opposite locations on the imaginary circle). These two high probability distractor locations are
24 fixed for each participant and counterbalanced across participants. Figure 2 shows the
25 schematic illustration of search displays. The target appears with equal probability and
26 randomly in the distractor absent trials at each search location. However, in distractor present
27 trials, the target’s location is randomly determined such that it does not coincide with the color
28 singleton distractor location.

29

30 Auditory stimulus manipulations: No auditory stimulus will be presented to the
31 participants for the distractor absent trials. However, for the distractor present trials, an auditory
32 stimulus will be presented simultaneously with the search display. There are two critical
33 manipulations in the auditory stimulus presentations. First, when the additional singleton
34 distractor appears in one of the two high probability search locations, the auditory stimulus will

Cross-modal statistical regularities and Visual selection

1 be more likely (80 %) to be presented at the spatially congruent side of the distractor location
2 (left or right hemifield) and less likely (20 %) to be presented at the spatially incongruent side.
3 Second, when the additional singleton distractor appears at one of the low probability distractor
4 locations, the auditory stimulus is presented by both left and right sided speakers. Thus, the
5 auditory stimulus is virtually perceived to be coming from the center of the search display. This
6 makes the auditory stimulus uninformative about the distractor location in the search display.
7

8 The combination of the additional singleton distractor and auditory stimulus manipulations
9 in the trials generate following four different experimental conditions:

- 10 a) No distractor trials with no auditory stimulus (“no-distractor” condition)
- 11 b) Distractor appears in one of the two high probability locations with auditory stimulus
12 location match (“high-probability valid distractor location”)
- 13 c) Distractor appears in one of the two high probability locations with auditory stimulus
14 location mismatch (“high-probability invalid distractor location”)
- 15 d) Distractor appears in one of the low probability locations with the uninformative
16 auditory stimulus (“low-probability distractor location”)


17
18 The experiment will start with 20 practice trials and 6 experimental blocks of 192 trials each.
19 The color of the additional singleton (red or green) and the orientation of the line segment
20 (horizontal or vertical) embedded in the target shape will be presented randomly with equal
21 probability in each experimental block. A 30-second break will be given to participants after
22 completing each experimental block.
23

24 Testing participants’ awareness of statistical regularities: To determine whether participants
25 are aware of the relationship between auditory and visual distractor location regularities, all
26 participants will be asked to answer forced-choice questions at the end of the experiment (See
27 supplementary materials section). First, participants will be asked to indicate whether they had
28 noticed regularities in the sound location such that the sound stimulus location was most
29 frequently matching the color distractor location in display on a rating scale from 1 to 6. Second,
30 we will inform the participants that each sound stimulus location (Left or Right) was most
31 frequently matched with a specific color distractor location in display and asked to rank three
32 such locations for each sound stimulus location separately. The rating scale and ranking
33 methods are, arguably, more sensitive measures for testing awareness than dichotomous “Yes”
34 or “No” responses and/or indicating a location where participant believes that the

1 target/distractor appeared most frequently (Giménez-Fernández et al., 2020; Vadillo et al.,
 2 2020).

3
 4

Deleted: ¶
 ¶
 ¶
 ¶
 ¶



5
 6 **Figure 2.** (A) Schematic illustration of search displays. Examples of the search display. The participant's task is
 7 to search for shape singleton. In distractor present trials, participants will be instructed to ignore the colour-
 8 singleton distractor. (B) Schematic illustration of spatial regularities of distractors. Low-probability distractor
 9 locations are shown in light blue, and high-probability distractor locations are shown in dark blue. Note: the
 10 schematic display is not drawn to the scale/color.

11
 12

13 **Experiment 2:**

14 The experiment 2 is aimed to test whether the study participants learn to utilize the task-
 15 irrelevant auditory non-spatial, frequency-based statistical regularities, simultaneously
 16 presented across search displays, indicating salient visual distractor's likely location influence
 17 visual search task performance. Like experiment 1, we hypothesize that the salient distractor
 18 locations indicated by the auditory stimuli (valid distractor location trial) would be perceptually
 19 suppressed according to the pro-active distractor suppression account, thereby impairing the
 20 distractor interference in visual search tasks (Huang et al., 2021; Wang, Driel, et al., 2019).

21
 22

22 **Procedure and Design for experiment 2:**

Cross-modal statistical regularities and Visual selection

1 The experimental procedure and design will be the same as experiment 1, except
2 following changes to auditory stimulus presentations. In experiment 2, auditory stimuli consist
3 of two pure tones (50ms duration) with either 500 or 1000 Hz frequency presented via
4 headphones. No auditory stimulus will be presented to the participants for the distractor absent
5 trials. However, for the distractor present trials, an auditory stimulus will be presented
6 simultaneously with the search display. There are two critical manipulations in the auditory
7 stimulus presentations. First, when the additional singleton distractor appears in one of the two
8 high-probability search locations, the auditory stimulus will be more likely (80%) presented
9 with one of the two pure tones (e.g., 500Hz frequency tone) and less likely (20%) presented
10 with the other pure tone (e.g., 1000Hz frequency tone) and vice versa. Second, when the
11 additional singleton distractor appears at one of the low probability distractor locations, the
12 auditory stimulus will be a noise burst with a 50ms duration.

13

14 Like experiment 1, the combination of the additional singleton distractor and auditory
15 stimulus manipulations in the trials generate following four different experimental conditions:

- 16 a) No distractor trials with no auditory stimulus (“no-distractor” condition)
- 17 b) Distractor appears in one of the two high probability locations with auditory stimulus
18 feature match (“high-probability valid distractor location”)
- 19 c) Distractor appears in one of the two high probability locations with auditory stimulus
20 feature mismatch (“high-probability invalid distractor location”)
- 21 d) Distractor appears in one of the low probability locations with the uninformative
22 auditory stimulus (“low-probability distractor locations”)

23

24 Testing participants’ awareness of statistical regularities: The questionnaire for the
25 experiment 2 will be similar to the experiment 1 mentioned above, except that, we will use text
26 sound pitch either high or low instead of the text mentioning the right or left sound locations.

27

28 **Participant and data replacement:**

29 Any of the following criteria will be used to replace a given participant in both the
30 experiments:

- 31 1) The participant performed the task with less than 75% accuracy. This would suggest
32 that the participant is either not engaged in the task or not understood the instructions.
- 33 2) Any participant who voluntarily choose not to perform the task at any time before
34 completing the experiment.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

Data analysis plan:

Identical but separate data analysis will be performed for experiment 1 and 2. The incorrect responses and response times (RTs) shorter than 200ms will be discarded before performing statistical analysis on RT data. If the assumptions of normality and sphericity are violated, appropriate non-parametric tests and sphericity corrections (Greenhouse-Geisser correction) will be applied to the statistical results.

Analysis on Response times (RTs): As mentioned in Figure 1, the relevant comparison is to test whether the auditory regularities influence distractor suppression. For this comparison, we will use paired t-test to compare experimental conditions of “high-probability valid distractor location” with “high-probability invalid distractor location”.

Analysis of participants’ awareness of regularities: We will calculate the mean rating for Question #1 in the questionnaire for the awareness test (see the supplementary materials). As mentioned in the methods above, all participants will be asked to rank three locations for each sound stimulus condition separately (Question #2 & Question #3). The first, second, and third-ranked locations will be given scores of 3, 2, and 1, respectively. For the remaining locations, the scores will be zero. We will assign these locations into five categories (0-4) depending on their distance from the corresponding HpValD location. For example, 0 corresponds to the HpValD location; 1 corresponds to two locations immediately next to the HpValD location, and so on. For each participant, we will then combine the data of Question #2 & Question #3 to calculate the mean scores obtained by locations according to the five categories mentioned above (0-4). These data will be analyzed using a linear mixed-effects model with a random intercept for participants to determine a linear relationship between scores obtained by each location and their distance from the HpValD location (0-4).

Predicted Outcomes:


The experimental question is whether the task-irrelevant auditory regularities indicative of the additional singleton location in the visual search display modulates the search efficiency.

1 Suppose the auditory regularities indeed generate the predictions for the likely distractor
 2 location. In that case, these distractor locations (in “high-probability valid distractor location”)
 3 are perceptually suppressed, and the RTs in those trials are shorter than invalid distractor
 4 locations (in “high-probability invalid distractor location” trials). Likewise, in experiment 2,
 5 RTs expected to be shorter for high-probability valid distractor location (indicated by sound
 6 feature) than high-probability invalid distractor location. A graphical representation of
 7 experimental predictions is presented in Figure 1.

8 **Supplementary Materials**

9 **Pilot Experiment:**

10 We have conducted a pilot experiment (N=5) to test the feasibility of the study and to
 11 test whether color distractors in the search displays can capture attention. The pilot
 12 experiment is the conceptual replication of the study design done by Wang and Theeuwes,
 13 2018. The pilot study indicated that the high probability color singleton distractor location
 14 (HpSD) condition is suppressed and facilitated the visual search efficiency by indicating
 15 faster RTs than the low probability color singleton distractor locations (LpSD) condition.
 16 Figure 3 shows the mean RTs for different distractor conditions on the pilot experiment. The
 17 raw data of the pilot study is available at the OSF repository at the following link:
 18 https://osf.io/yba2k/?view_only=ec7ab987de2f4486aa653f24d03936f5
 19



20
 21 **Figure 3:** Pilot conceptual replication of the study design done by Wang and Theeuwes, 2018. The pilot study
 22 indicated that the high probability color singleton distractor location (HpSD) is suppressed and facilitated the
 23 visual search task efficiency by indicating faster RTs than the low probability color singleton distractor locations
 24 (LpSD).

Formatted: Centred, Indent: First line: 0 cm, Right: -0.08 cm, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Deleted: ¶

1 **Questionnaire for testing awareness of statistical regularities:**

2 **For experiment 1:**

3

4 Question #1: You might have noticed that, in most of the displays, one of the visual items in display
5 appeared in a different color than the rest (e.g., red color visual item among green items or vice
6 versa). Do you think that a given sound location (e.g., the sound coming from the Left or Right side of
7 the display) was most frequently matching a particular location of this visual item in the display?
8

9

Please respond honestly by choosing one of the options mentioned below:

10

- 11 * Definitely not (Press 1)
- 12 * Probably not (Press 2)
- 13 * Possibly not (Press 3)
- 14 * Possibly yes (Press 4)
- 15 * Probably yes (Press 5)
- 16 * Definitely yes (Press 6)


17

18 Question #2: In the experiment, in most of the trials, the sound coming from the left side of the
19 display was most frequently matched with a particular location of the differently colored visual item
20 in the display.

21

22 * Now, if you had to choose a particular location where the differently colored visual item
23 frequently appeared along with the sound coming from the left side of the display, which one that
24 would be, in your opinion? Please indicate such location by pressing corresponding numbered spatial
25 locations shown on the below example display.


26



27

28 * Now, ignoring your previous response, if you had to choose the next location where the
29 differently colored visual item frequently appeared along with the sound coming from the left side of
30 the display, which one that would be, in your opinion? Please indicate such location by pressing
31 corresponding numbered spatial locations shown on the below example display.

32




33

34 * Finally, ignoring your previous response, if you had to choose the next location where the
35 differently colored visual item frequently appeared along with the sound coming from the left side of
36 the display, which one that would be, in your opinion? Please indicate such location by pressing
37 corresponding numbered spatial locations shown on the below example display.

38


Cross-modal statistical regularities and Visual selection



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10


Question #3: In the experiment, in most of the trials, the sound coming from the right side of the display was most frequently matched with a particular location of the differently colored visual item in the display.

* Now, if you had to choose a particular location where the differently colored visual item frequently appeared along with the sound coming from the Right side of the display, which one that would be, in your opinion? Please indicate such location by pressing corresponding numbered spatial locations shown on the below example display




11
12
13
14
15

* Now, ignoring your previous response, if you had to choose the next location where the differently colored visual item frequently appeared along with the sound coming from the Right side of the display, which one that would be, in your opinion? Please indicate such location by pressing corresponding numbered spatial locations shown on the below example display.



16
17
18
19
20

* Finally, ignoring your previous response, if you had to choose the next location where the differently colored visual item frequently appeared along with the sound coming from the Right side of the display, which one that would be, in your opinion? Please indicate such location by pressing corresponding numbered spatial locations shown on the below example display.



21
22
23
24
25
26

For experiment 2:

The questionnaire for experiment 2 will be similar to the experiment 1 mentioned above, except that we will use text sound pitch either high or low instead of the text mentioning the right or left sound locations.

1 **Acknowledgements:**

2 We would like to thank, in advance, study participants for their time.

3

4 **CRediT Authorship contribution statement:**

5 KKJ: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Formal analysis, Visualization, Software,

6 Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing

7 MMS: Supervision, Resources, Writing - review & editing,

8

9 **Competing interests:**

10 The authors declare no competing interests.

11

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

References:

Awh, E., Belopolsky, A. V., & Theeuwes, J. (2012). Top-down versus bottom-up attentional control: a failed theoretical dichotomy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(8), 437–443. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2012.06.010>

Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, 10(4), 433–436. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156856897x00357>

Chen, S., Shi, Z., Müller, H. J., & Geyer, T. (2021). Multisensory visuo-tactile context learning enhances the guidance of unisensory visual search. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 9439. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-88946-6>

Chen, S., Shi, Z., Zang, X., Zhu, X., Assumpção, L., Müller, H. J., & Geyer, T. (2020). Crossmodal learning of target-context associations: When would tactile context predict visual search? *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 82(4), 1682–1694. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-019-01907-0>

Chun, M. M., & Jiang, Y. (1998). Contextual Cueing: Implicit Learning and Memory of Visual Context Guides Spatial Attention. *Cognitive Psychology*, 36(1), 28–71. <https://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.1998.0681>

Dienes, Z. (2021). Obtaining Evidence for No Effect. *Collabra: Psychology*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.28202>

Duncan, D., & Theeuwes, J. (2020). Statistical learning in the absence of explicit top-down attention. *Cortex*, 131, 54–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.07.006>

Egeth, H. E., & Yantis, S. (1997). VISUAL ATTENTION: Control, Representation, and Time Course. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48(1), 269–297. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.269>

Failing, M., Feldmann-Wüstefeld, T., Wang, B., Olivers, C., & Theeuwes, J. (2019). Statistical Regularities Induce Spatial as well as Feature-Specific Suppression. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 45(10), 1291–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0000660>

Failing, M., Wang, B., & Theeuwes, J. (2019). Spatial suppression due to statistical regularities is driven by distractor suppression not by target activation. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 81(5), 1405–1414. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-019-01704-9>

- 1 Frost, R., Armstrong, B. C., & Christiansen, M. H. (2019). Statistical Learning Research: A
 2 Critical Review and Possible New Directions. *Psychological Bulletin*, *145*(12), 1128–
 3 1153. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000210>
- 4 Frost, R., Armstrong, B. C., Siegelman, N., & Christiansen, M. H. (2015). Domain generality
 5 versus modality specificity: the paradox of statistical learning. *Trends in Cognitive*
 6 *Sciences*, *19*(3), 117–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.12.010>
- 7 Geng, J. J., & Behrmann, M. (2002). Probability Cuing of Target Location Facilitates Visual
 8 Search Implicitly in Normal Participants and Patients with Hemispatial Neglect.
 9 *Psychological Science*, *13*(6), 520–525. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00491>
- 10 Geng, J. J., & Behrmann, M. (2005). Spatial probability as an attentional cue in visual search.
 11 *Perception & Psychophysics*, *67*(7), 1252–1268. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03193557>
- 12 Giménez-Fernández, T., Luque, D., Shanks, D. R., & Vadillo, M. A. (2020). Probabilistic
 13 cuing of visual search: Neither implicit nor inflexible. *Journal of Experimental*
 14 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *46*(10), 1222–1234.
 15 <https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0000852>
- 16 Huang, C., Vilotijević, A., Theeuwes, J., & Donk, M. (2021). Proactive distractor suppression
 17 elicited by statistical regularities in visual search. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 1–10.
 18 <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-021-01891-3>
- 19 Jiang, Y. V., Swallow, K. M., Rosenbaum, G. M., & Herzig, C. (2013). Rapid Acquisition
 20 but Slow Extinction of an Attentional Bias in Space. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
 21 *Human Perception and Performance*, *39*(1), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027611>
- 22 Kawahara, J.-I. (2007). Auditory-visual contextual cuing effect. *Perception & Psychophysics*,
 23 *69*(8), 1399–1408. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03192955>
- 24 Li, A.-S., & Theeuwes, J. (2020). Statistical regularities across trials bias attentional
 25 selection. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*,
 26 *46*(8), 860–870. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0000753>
- 27 Lin, R., Li, X., Wang, B., & Theeuwes, J. (2020). Spatial suppression due to statistical
 28 learning tracks the estimated spatial probability. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*,
 29 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-020-02156-2>
- 30 Luck, S. J., Gaspelin, N., Folk, C. L., Remington, R. W., & Theeuwes, J. (2020). Progress
 31 toward resolving the attentional capture debate. *Visual Cognition*, 1–21.
 32 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506285.2020.1848949>
- 33 Nabeta, T., Ono, F., & Kawahara, J.-I. (2002). Transfer of Spatial Context from Visual to
 34 Haptic Search. *Perception*, *32*(11), 1351–1358. <https://doi.org/10.1068/p5135>
- 35 Perugini, M., Gallucci, M., & Costantini, G. (2014). Safeguard Power as a Protection Against
 36 Imprecise Power Estimates. *Perspectives on Psychological Science: A Journal of the*
 37 *Association for Psychological Science*, *9*(3), 319–332.
 38 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614528519>

- 1 Stilwell, B. T., Bahle, B., & Vecera, S. P. (2019). Feature-Based Statistical Regularities of
 2 Distractors Modulate Attentional Capture. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*
 3 *Perception and Performance*, 45(3), 419–433. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0000613>
- 4 Theeuwes, J. (1991). Cross-dimensional perceptual selectivity. *Perception & Psychophysics*,
 5 50(2), 184–193. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03212219>
- 6 Theeuwes, J. (1992). Perceptual selectivity for color and form. *Perception & Psychophysics*,
 7 51(6), 599–606. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03211656>
- 8 Theeuwes, J. (2010a). Top-down and bottom-up control of visual selection. *Acta*
 9 *Psychologica*, 135(2), 77–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2010.02.006>
- 10 Theeuwes, J. (2010b). Top-down and bottom-up control of visual selection: Reply to
 11 commentaries. *Acta Psychologica*, 135(2), 133–139.
 12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2010.07.006>
- 13 Theeuwes, J., & Failing, M. (2020). *Attentional Selection*.
 14 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108891288>
- 15 Theeuwes, J., Wang, B., Driel, J. van, & Olivers, C. N. L. (2018). Statistical learning shapes
 16 distractor suppression. *Journal of Vision*, 18(10), 1223. <https://doi.org/10.1167/18.10.1223>
- 17 Vadillo, M. A., Linssen, D., Orgaz, C., Parsons, S., & Shanks, D. R. (2020). Unconscious or
 18 underpowered? Probabilistic cuing of visual attention. *Journal of Experimental*
 19 *Psychology: General*, 149(1), 160–181. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000632>
- 20 Wang, B., Driel, J. van, Ort, E., & Theeuwes, J. (2019). Anticipatory Distractor Suppression
 21 Elicited by Statistical Regularities in Visual Search. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*,
 22 31(10), 1535–1548. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01433
- 23 Wang, B., Samara, I., & Theeuwes, J. (2019). Statistical regularities bias overt attention.
 24 *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 81(6), 1813–1821.
 25 <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-019-01708-5>
- 26 Wang, B., & Theeuwes, J. (2018a). How to inhibit a distractor location? Statistical learning
 27 versus active, top-down suppression. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 80(4), 860–
 28 870. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-018-1493-z>
- 29 Wang, B., & Theeuwes, J. (2018b). Statistical Regularities Modulate Attentional Capture.
 30 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 44(1), 13–17.
 31 <https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0000472>
- 32 Wang, B., & Theeuwes, J. (2018c). Statistical regularities modulate attentional capture
 33 independent of search strategy. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 80(7), 1763–
 34 1774. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-018-1562-3>

35