Supplementary Information for

Scaling Up Psychology via Scientific Regret Minimization

- **Mayank Agrawal, Joshua C. Peterson, Thomas L. Griffiths**
- **Mayank Agrawal.**

E-mail: mayank.agrawal@princeton.edu

This PDF file includes:

- Supplementary text
- Figs. S1 to S2
- Tables S1 to $\mathrm{S}16$
- References for SI reference citations

Supporting Information Text

Bayesian Feature Selection. To simulate an alternative approach towards exploratory data analysis, we conducted a form of

 Bayesian feature selection [\(1\)](#page-26-1). We trained a Bayesian logistic regression model with all 'Hybrid' model features and their two-and three-way interactions. Each weight was given a prior of a Gaussian distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation 0*.*1.

Once this model was trained, all features in which a weight of 0 was located in its 95% credible interval were removed. We then

trained this new model, and repeated this procedure until all features that were fit were significant. (More computationally

 intensive variable selection procedures, such as marginal likelihood, were infeasible given the size of the dataset). Table S15 outlines the iterations' metrics and Table S16 reports the final features and their weights.

 The resulting model from this approach performed a little better than the original 'Hybrid' model and far worse than our final choice model (and in fact worse than the model after our first iteration). It seems that for such an approach to rival ours,

we would have needed to start off with a model that encapsulated at least all twenty-way interactions. Such a model would be

even more intractable to conduct for Bayesian feature selection.

²⁴ **Methods.** Due to the size of the dataset and the feature set, this model was trained through variational inference [\(2\)](#page-26-2) rather

 than traditional MCMC sampling. The model was trained using a Flipout gradient estimator [\(3\)](#page-26-3) and optimized via Adam [\(4\)](#page-26-4). Metrics were computed by taking the MAP estimate of each weight. The model was trained using the Tensorflow Probability

package (5) .

Fig. S1. A calibration plot between the neural network's predictions and the aggregate dilemmas for all dilemmas over one hundred responses. We calculated a line of best fit for all dilemmas (*i.e.* not just those with over hundred responses), weighting each dilemma by the number of participants that answered it. The line of best fit had a slope of 1.003 and an intercept of 0.001.

Table S1. Old vs. Young Dilemmas (proportions show observed or predicted proportion killing left side).

	N	Data		Choice Model Neural Network
င် $ \bullet$ U	11554	0.343	0.636	0.333
	11578	0.362	0.637	0.344
	7166		0.721 0.511	0.747
	5758	0.523	0.635	0.403
	5691	0.476	0.625	0.395

Table S2. Biggest Differences Between Choice Model and Data for Second Iteration

	N ₁	Data		Choice Model Neural Network
a ို	130	0.600	0.869	0.537
	1471		0.434 0.712	0.394
	2898	0.436	0.714	0.420
$ {}_{\circ}^{\circ}$	3879	0.520	0.786	0.509
	3377	0.224	0.508	0.231

Table S3. Biggest Differences Between Choice Model and Neural Network for Second Iteration

N	Data		Choice Model Neural Network
649		0.994 0.155	0.168
1124	0.000	0.605	0.442
	1113 0.288	0.806	0.680
890	0.001	0.693	0.272
365	0.326	0.709	0.719

Table S4. Biggest Differences Between Choice Model and Data for Third Iteration

	N ₁	Data		Choice Model Neural Network
	162		0.599 0.835	0.567
	2606		0.558 0.765	0.499
е		8235 0.340	0.637	0.373
	175	0.269	0.541	0.283
	359		0.315 0.539	0.290

Table S5. Biggest Differences Between Choice Model and Neural Network for Third Iteration

N	Data		Choice Model Neural Network
649		0.994 0.147	0.168
1124		0.000 0.517	0.442
	1113 0.288	0.763	0.680
365	0.326	0.766	0.719
187		0.001 0.427	0.393

Table S6. Biggest Differences Between Choice Model and Data for Fourth Iteration

N			Data Choice Model Neural Network
175	0.269	0.560	0.283
326		0.301 0.564	0.301
359		0.315 0.552	0.290
172	0.273	0.556	0.304
159	0.308	0.568	0.323

Table S7. Biggest Differences Between Choice Model and Neural Network for Fourth Iteration

Table S8. Features and Weights for Final Choice Model

Fig. S2. Two Moral Machine dilemmas that demonstrate an age gradient. Rational choice models treat these dilemmas equivalently, but the data indicated that participants do not do so when the side with children is illegally crossing.

Table S9. Results from Experiment 1 comparing the percentage of participants that save criminals versus dogs and the percentage of \bm{p} articipants that save other humans versus dogs. We used a χ^2 analysis between the proportions, where $N=326$ and $df=1.$

Table S10. Results from the Moral Machine dataset corresponding to the scenarios in Experiment 1 / Supplementary Table S9.

(a) Male

Car Side	Signal (Young)	$%$ Save (with Adult)	$%$ Save (without Adult)	p -value	Prediction
Young	Legal	0.83	0.77	$p=.013$	Null
Young	N/A	0.77	0.75	$p=.600$	Null
Young	Illegal	0.71	0.64	$p=.024$	Significant
Old	Legal	0.90	0.91	$p=.827$	Null
Old	N/A	0.92	0.93	$p=.538$	Null
Old	Illegal	0.81	0.75	$p=.030$	Significant

(b) Female

Table S11. Results from Experiment 2 comparing the percentage of participants that save the young side with an adult versus the percentage of participants that save the young side without the adult. We used a χ^2 analysis between the proportions, where $N=489$ and $d\bar{f}=1.$

Table S12. Results from the Moral Machine dataset corresponding to the scenarios in Experiment 2 / Supplementary Table S11.

(a) Male-Female Dilemmas

Car Side	Aae	$%$ Save (No Signal)	$%$ Save (Mean)	p -value	Prediction
Male	Adult	0.14	0.25	p < .001	Significant
Female	Adult	0.55	0.50	$p=.224$	Null
Male	Old	0.19	0.27	$p=.012$	Significant
Female	Old	0.55	0.50	$p=.196$	Null

Car Side	Sex	% Save (No Signal)	$%$ Save (Mean)	p -value	Prediction
Fat	Male	0.15	0.27	p < .001	Significant
Fit	Male	0.44	0.46	$p=.609$	Null
Fat	Female	0.16	0.26	$p=.003$	Significant
Fit	Female	0.47	0.42	$p=.253$	Null

(b) Fat-Fit Dilemmas

Table S13. Results from Experiment 3 comparing the percentage of participants that save the higher-valued individual in the no crossing signal condition versus the mean of the percentages of participants saving the higher-valued individual in the other two crossing signal $\bf{conditions.}$ We used a χ^2 analysis between the proportions, in which $N=326$ and $df=1.$

Table S14. Results from the Moral Machine dataset corresponding to the scenarios in Experiment 3 / Supplementary Table S13.

Iteration No.	No. of Features	Accuracy	AUC	$\rm AIC$
1	1562	0.757	0.816	1.058
2	1251	0.757	0.816	1.053
3	678	0.758	0.818	1.046
4	519	0.758	0.819	1.041
5	372	0.758	0.819	1.041
6	289	0.759	0.819	1.041
7	250	0.759	0.819	1.041
8	235	0.759	0.819	1.041
9	227	0.759	0.819	1.041
10	220	0.758	0.819	1.041
11	212	0.758	0.819	1.041
12	207	0.757	0.819	1.041
13	185	0.759	0.819	1.041
14	181	0.758	0.819	1.040

Table S15. Iterations of Bayesian Feature Selection

Male Doctor * Cat * Crossing Signal 0.094 0.013 **Table S16. Mean and Standard Deviation of Posterior Weights for Bayesian Variable Selection**

References

- 1. Mitchell TJ, Beauchamp JJ (1988) Bayesian variable selection in linear regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83(404):1023–1032.
- 2. Blei DM, Kucukelbir A, McAuliffe JD (2017) Variational inference: A review for statisticians. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 112(518):859–877.
- 3. Wen Y, Vicol P, Ba J, Tran D, Grosse R (2018) Flipout: Efficient pseudo-independent weight perturbations on mini-batches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.04386*.
- 4. Kingma DP, Ba J (2014) Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- 5. Dillon JV, et al. (2017) Tensorflow distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10604*.