

Dissociating the effect of disruptive colouration on localisation and identification of camouflaged targets.

Rebecca J. Sharman¹,

Stephen Moncrieff²,

Paul George Lovell².

- 1. University of Stirling, School of Psychology, Bridge of Allan, FK9 4LA**
- 2. Abertay University, Division of Psychology, School of Social and Health Sciences, 1, Bell St, Dundee, DD1 1HG**

Supplementary Materials.

Table S1: Bayesian ANOVA analysis of results

Model Comparison - dependent

Models	P(M)	P(M data)	Log(BF_M)	Log(BF₁₀)	% error
Null model (incl. subject)	0.053	8.392e -63	-140.045	0	
camoType	0.053	3.798e -57	-127.022	13.023	0.833
Background Type	0.053	4.670e -53	-117.605	22.44	1.234
camoType + Background Type	0.053	8.864e -46	-100.847	39.199	1.036
camoType + Background Type + camoType * Background Type	0.053	1.073e -43	-96.051	43.995	5.543
task	0.053	5.476e -41	-89.815	50.23	1.986
camoType + task	0.053	2.572e -31	-67.545	72.5	6.419
Background Type + task	0.053	5.185e -25	-53.029	87.017	1.705
camoType + Background Type + task	0.053	1.276e -10	-19.892	120.154	13.962
camoType + Background Type + camoType * Background Type + task	0.053	2.232e -5	-7.82	132.226	5.547
camoType + task + camoType * task	0.053	8.187e -32	-68.69	71.355	1.616
camoType + Background Type + task + camoType * task	0.053	7.539e -11	-20.418	119.627	4.09
camoType + Background Type + camoType * Background Type + task + camoType * task	0.053	2.063e -5	-7.898	132.147	2.266
Background Type + task + Background Type * task	0.053	1.701e -22	-47.235	92.81	3.129
camoType + Background Type + task + Background Type * task	0.053	4.531e -7	-11.717	128.329	3.402
camoType + Background Type + camoType * Background Type + task + Background Type * task	0.053	0.395	2.464	142.007	10.364

camoType + Background Type + task + camoType * task + Background Type * task	0.053	4.365e -7	-11.754	128.291	6.001
camoType + Background Type + camoType * Background Type + task + camoType * task + Background Type * task	0.053	0.51	2.93	142.262	5.004
camoType + Background Type + camoType * Background Type + task + camoType * task + Background Type * task + camoType * Background Type * task	0.053	0.095	0.638	140.583	2.707

Note. All models include subject.

Analysis of Effects - dependent

Effects	P(incl)	P(incl data)	Log(BF _{Inclusion})
camoType		1	35.707
Background Type		1	35.707
task		1	35.707
camoType * Background Type		1	14.705
camoType * task		0.605	1.2
Background Type * task		1	10.829
camoType * Background Type * task		0.095	0.638

Table S2: Bayesian T-Test Analysis of Results.

Task			Bayes Paired T-Test		Shapiro-Wilks	
			BF ₁₀	error %	W	p
Locate	Matching Background					
	uniform	- eeCamo	94715.187	3.704e -11	0.929	0.117
	uniform	- flatCamo	0.838	9.273e -5	0.908	0.044
	flatCamo	- eeCamo	589.244	1.908e -9	0.958	0.452
	Contrasting Background					
	uniform	- eeCamo	0.258	3.172e -4	0.878	0.011
	uniform	- flatCamo	0.225	3.094e -4	0.911	0.05
	flatCamo	- eeCamo	0.249	3.162e -4	0.94	0.194
	Classify	Matching Background				
uniform		- eeCamo	2389.892	6.886e -10	0.949	0.306
uniform		- flatCamo	3.732	1.203e -5	0.974	0.798
flatCamo		- eeCamo	1674.471	4.817e -10	0.979	0.9
Contrasting Background						
uniform		- eeCamo	13.234	6.371e -6	0.962	0.532
uniform		- flatCamo	0.302	3.126e -4	0.926	0.102
flatCamo		- eeCamo	4.756	1.304e -5	0.969	0.688