UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

How to measure subjective experience

Carvajal Sánchez, N.A.

Publication date
2025

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Carvajal Sánchez, N. A. (2025). *How to measure subjective experience*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:16 Sept 2026

Contributions to the chapters

The contributions below were specified according to the CRediT *system* [Contributor Roles Taxonomy; https://credit.niso.org/; Brand et al. (2015)].

Chapter 2, published as:
Sánchez-Fuenzalida, N., van Gaal, S., Fleming, S. M., Haaf, J. M., Fahrenfort, J. J. (2023). Predictions and rewards affect decision-making but not subjective experience. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 120*(44) e2220749120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2220749120

- **N. Sánchez-Fuenzalida**: Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft.
- **S. van Gaal**: Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Writing - review & editing.
- **S. M. Fleming**: Conceptualization, Writing - review & editing.
- **J. M. Haaf**: Methodology, Resources, Writing - review & editing.
- **J. J. Fahrenfort**: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Project administration, Writing - review & editing.

Chapter 3, based on:
Sánchez-Fuenzalida, N., van Gaal, S., Fleming, S. M., Haaf, J. M., Fahrenfort, J. J. (in press). Confidence reports during perceptual decision making dissociate from changes in subjective experience. *Communications Psychology.*

- **N. Sánchez-Fuenzalida**: Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft.
- **S. van Gaal**: Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Writing - review & editing.
- **S. M. Fleming**: Conceptualization, Writing - review & editing.
- **J. M. Haaf**: Methodology, Resources, Writing - review & editing.
- **J. J. Fahrenfort**: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Project administration, Writing - review & editing.

Chapter 4, in preparation as:

Sánchez-Fuenzalida, N., Jungerius, C., Fleming, S. M., van Gaal, S., Fahrenfort, J. J. (2025). Conscious experience in a near-threshold detection task is influenced by attentional cues, not by predictions or rewards.

- **N. Sánchez-Fuenzalida**: Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft.
- **C. Jungerius**: Methodology, Resources, Writing - review & editing.
- **S. M. Fleming**: Conceptualization, Writing - review & editing.
- **S. van Gaal**: Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Writing - review & editing.
- **J. J. Fahrenfort**: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Project administration, Writing - review & editing.

Bibliography

Ackermann, J. F., & Landy, M. S. (2015). Suboptimal decision criteria are predicted by subjectively weighted probabilities and rewards. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *77*(2), 638–658. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-014-0779-z

Azzopardi, P., & Cowey, A. (1997). Is blindsight like normal, near-threshold vision? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *94*(25), 14190–14194.

Azzopardi, P., & Cowey, A. (1998). Blindsight and Visual Awareness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *7*(3), 292–311. https://doi.org/10.1006/ccog.1998.0358

Azzopardi, P., & Evans, S. (2007). Evaluation of a 'bias-free' measure of awareness. *Spatial Vision*, *20*(1-2), 61–77. https://doi.org/10.1163/156856807779369742

Balakrishnan, J. D., & Ratcliff, R. (1996). Testing models of decision making using confidence ratings in classification. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *22*(3), 615–633. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.22.3.615

Balestrieri, E., & Busch, N. A. (2021). *Spontaneous alpha-band oscillations bias subjective contrast perception* (p. 2021.09.09.459569). Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.09.459569

Balsdon, T., & Azzopardi, P. (2015). Absolute and relative blindsight. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *32*, 79–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2014.09.010

Barthelmé, S., & Mamassian, P. (2009). Evaluation of Objective Uncertainty in the Visual System. *PLOS Computational Biology*, *5*(9), e1000504. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000504

Barthelmé, S., & Mamassian, P. (2010). Flexible mechanisms underlie the evaluation of visual confidence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *107*(48), 20834–20839. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1007704107

Beerendonk, L., Mejías, J. F., Nuiten, S. A., de Gee, J. W., Fahrenfort, J. J., & van Gaal, S. (2024). A disinhibitory circuit mechanism explains a general principle of peak performance during mid-level arousal. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *121*(5), e2312898121. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2312898121

Björkman, M., Juslin, P., & Winman, A. (1993). Realism of confidence in sensory discrimination: The underconfidence phenomenon. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *54*(1), 75–81. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03206939

Blackwell, H. R. (1963). Neural Theories of Simple Visual Discriminations*†. *JOSA*, *53*(1), 129–160. https://doi.org/10.1364/JOSA.53.000129

Block, N. (1995). On a confusion about a function of consciousness. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *18*(2), 227–247. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00038188

Bogacz, R., Brown, E., Moehlis, J., Holmes, P., & Cohen, J. D. (2006). The physics

of optimal decision making: A formal analysis of models of performance in two-alternative forced-choice tasks. *Psychological Review*, *113*(4), 700–765. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.113.4.700

Bosch, E., Fritsche, M., Ehinger, B. V., & de Lange, F. P. (2020). Opposite effects of choice history and evidence history resolve a paradox of sequential choice bias. *Journal of Vision*, *20*(12), 9. https://doi.org/10.1167/jov.20.12.9

Boundy-Singer, Z. M., Ziemba, C. M., & Goris, R. L. T. (2022). Confidence reflects a noisy decision reliability estimate. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01464-x

Brand, A., Allen, L., Altman, M., Hlava, M., & Scott, J. (2015). Beyond authorship: Attribution, contribution, collaboration, and credit. *Learned Publishing*, *28*(2), 151–155. https://doi.org/10.1087/20150211

Bulatov, A., Bertulis, A., Bulatova, N., & Loginovich, Y. (2009). Centroid extraction and illusions of extent with different contextual flanks. *Acta Neurobiologiae Experimentalis*, *69*(4), 504–525. https://doi.org/10.55782/ane-2009-1760

Bulatov, A., Bertulis, A., Gutauskas, A., & Bulatova, N. (2010). Stimulus size and the magnitude of the visual illusion of extent. *Human Physiology*, *36*(2), 164–171. https://doi.org/10.1134/S0362119710020064

Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). Brms: An R Package for Bayesian Multilevel Models Using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *80*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01

Carrasco, M. (2006). Covert attention increases contrast sensitivity: Psychophysical, neurophysiological and neuroimaging studies. In S. Martinez-Conde, S. L. Macknik, L. M. Martinez, J.-M. Alonso, & P. U. Tse (Eds.), *Progress in Brain Research* (Vol. 154, pp. 33–70). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123(06)54003-8

Carrasco, M., & Barbot, A. (2019). Spatial attention alters visual appearance. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *29*, 56–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.10.010

Carrasco, M., Ling, S., & Read, S. (2004). Attention alters appearance. *Nature Neuroscience*, *7*(3), 308–313. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1194

Cerracchio, E., Miletić, S., & Forstmann, B. U. (2023). Modelling decision-making biases. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, *17*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2023.1222924

Charles, L., Van Opstal, F., Marti, S., & Dehaene, S. (2013). Distinct brain mechanisms for conscious versus subliminal error detection. *NeuroImage*, *73*, 80–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.01.054

Cheesman, J., & Merikle, P. M. (1986). Distinguishing conscious from unconscious perceptual processes. *Canadian Journal of Psychology / Revue Canadienne de Psychologie*, *40*(4), 343–367. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0080103

Clifford, C. W. G., Arabzadeh, E., & Harris, J. A. (2008). Getting technical about awareness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *12*(2), 54–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.11.009

Constant, M., Pereira, M., Faivre, N., & Filevich, E. (2023). Prior information differentially affects discrimination decisions and subjective confidence reports. *Nature Communications*, *14*(1), 5473. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-41112-0

Cutrone, E. K., Heeger, D. J., & Carrasco, M. (2014). Attention enhances contrast appearance via increased input baseline of neural responses. *Journal of Vision*,

14(14), 16. https://doi.org/10.1167/14.14.16

Daprati, E., & Gentilucci, M. (1997). Grasping an illusion. *Neuropsychologia*, *35*(12), 1577–1582. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(97)00061-4

de Gardelle, V., & Mamassian, P. (2014). Does Confidence Use a Common Currency Across Two Visual Tasks? *Psychological Science*, *25*(6), 1286–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614528956

de Gelder, B., Tamietto, M., van Boxtel, G., Goebel, R., Sahraie, A., van den Stock, J., Stienen, B. M. C., Weiskrantz, L., & Pegna, A. (2008). Intact navigation skills after bilateral loss of striate cortex. *Current Biology*, *18*(24), R1128–R1129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2008.11.002

de Lange, F. P., Heilbron, M., & Kok, P. (2018). How Do Expectations Shape Perception? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *22*(9), 764–779. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2018.06.002

Dehaene, S., Naccache, L., Le Clec'H, G., Koechlin, E., Mueller, M., Dehaene-Lambertz, G., van de Moortele, P.-F., & Le Bihan, D. (1998). Imaging unconscious semantic priming. *Nature*, *395*(6702), 597–600. https://doi.org/10.1038/26967

Dekel, R., & Sagi, D. (2020). Perceptual bias is reduced with longer reaction times during visual discrimination. *Communications Biology*, *3*(1), 59. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-020-0786-7

Desai, N., & Krajbich, I. (2022). Decomposing preferences into predispositions and evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, *151*(8), 1883–1903. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001162

Desender, K., Vermeylen, L., & Verguts, T. (2022). Dynamic influences on static measures of metacognition. *Nature Communications*, *13*(1), 4208. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-31727-0

Dickey, J. M., & Lientz, B. P. (1970). The Weighted Likelihood Ratio, Sharp Hypotheses about Chances, the Order of a Markov Chain. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, *41*(1), 214–226. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2239734

Dienes, Z., & Scott, R. (2005). Measuring unconscious knowledge: Distinguishing structural knowledge and judgment knowledge. *Psychological Research*, *69*(5), 338–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-004-0208-3

Dienes, Z., & Seth, A. (2010). Gambling on the unconscious: A comparison of wagering and confidence ratings as measures of awareness in an artificial grammar task. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *19*(2), 674–681. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2009.09.009

Dijkstra, N., Mazor, M., & Fleming, S. M. (2024). Confidence ratings do not distinguish imagination from reality. *Journal of Vision*, *24*(5), 13. https://doi.org/10.1167/jov.24.5.13

Dotan, D., Meyniel, F., & Dehaene, S. (2018). On-line confidence monitoring during decision making. *Cognition*, *171*, 112–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2017.11.001

Draine, S. C., & Greenwald, A. G. (1998). Replicable unconscious semantic priming. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *127*(3), 286–303. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.127.3.286

Duscherer, K., & Holender, D. (2005). The role of decision biases in semantic priming effects. *Swiss Journal of Psychology / Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie / Revue Suisse de Psychologie*, *64*(4), 249–258. https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185.

64.4.249

Eriksen, C. W. (1960). Discrimination and learning without awareness: A methodological survey and evaluation. *Psychological Review*, *67*(5), 279–300. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0041622

Evans, S., & Azzopardi, P. (2007). Evaluation of a 'bias-free' measure of awareness. *Spatial Vision*, *20*(1-2), 61–77. https://doi.org/10.1163/156856807779369742

Fahrenfort, J. J., Johnson, P. A., Kloosterman, N. A., Stein, T., & Gaal, S. van. (2024). Criterion placement threatens the construct validity of neural measures of consciousness. *eLife*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.102335.1

Fahrenfort, J. J., van Leeuwen, J., Olivers, C. N. L., & Hogendoorn, H. (2017). Perceptual integration without conscious access. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *114*(14), 3744–3749. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1617268114

Fechner, G. T. (1860). *Elemente der Psychophysik*. Breitkopf u. Härtel.

Felin, T., Koenderink, J., & Krueger, J. I. (2017). Rationality, perception, and the all-seeing eye. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *24*(4), 1040–1059. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-016-1198-z

Fetsch, C. R., Kiani, R., & Shadlen, M. N. (2014). Predicting the Accuracy of a Decision: A Neural Mechanism of Confidence. *Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology*, *79*, 185–197. https://doi.org/10.1101/sqb.2014.79.024893

Finkbeiner, M. (2011). Subliminal priming with nearly perfect performance in the prime-classification task. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *73*(4), 1255–1265. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-011-0088-8

Fleming, S. M. (2017). HMeta-d: Hierarchical Bayesian estimation of metacognitive efficiency from confidence ratings. *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, *2017*(1), nix007. https://doi.org/10.1093/nc/nix007

Fleming, S. M., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2012). Metacognition: Computation, biology and function. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *367*(1594), 1280–1286. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0021

Fleming, S. M., & Lau, H. C. (2014). How to measure metacognition. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*, 443. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00443

Fleming, S. M., Whiteley, L., Hulme, O. J., Sahani, M., & Dolan, R. J. (2010). Effects of category-specific costs on neural systems for perceptual decision-making. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *103*(6), 3238–3247. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.01084.2009

Francken, J. C., Beerendonk, L., Molenaar, D., Fahrenfort, J. J., Kiverstein, J. D., Seth, A. K., & van Gaal, S. (2022). An academic survey on theoretical foundations, common assumptions and the current state of consciousness science. *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, *2022*(1), niac011. https://doi.org/10.1093/nc/niac011

Fritsche, M., & Lange, F. P. de. (2019). The role of feature-based attention in visual serial dependence. *Journal of Vision*, *19*(13), 21–21. https://doi.org/10.1167/19.13.21

Fritsche, M., Mostert, P., & Lange, F. P. de. (2017). Opposite Effects of Recent History on Perception and Decision. *Current Biology*, *27*(4), 590–595. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.01.006

Fuller, S., Rodriguez, R. Z., & Carrasco, M. (2008). Apparent contrast differs across the vertical meridian: Visual and attentional factors. *Journal of Vision*, *8*(1), 16. https://doi.org/10.1167/8.1.16

Gallagher, R. M., Suddendorf, T., & Arnold, D. H. (2019). Confidence as a diagnostic tool for perceptual aftereffects. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 7124. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-43170-1

Gallagher, R. M., Suddendorf, T., & Arnold, D. H. (2021). The implied motion aftereffect changes decisions, but not confidence. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-021-02331-z

Garric, C., Sebaa, A., Caetta, F., Perez, C., Savatovsky, J., Sergent, C., & Chokron, S. (2019). Dissociation between objective and subjective perceptual experiences in a population of hemianopic patients: A new form of blindsight? *Cortex*, *117*, 299–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2019.05.006

Gerardin, P., Kourtzi, Z., & Mamassian, P. (2010). Prior knowledge of illumination for 3D perception in the human brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *107*(37), 16309–16314. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1006285107

Gesiarz, F., Cahill, D., & Sharot, T. (2019). Evidence accumulation is biased by motivation: A computational account. *PLOS Computational Biology*, *15*(6), e1007089. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007089

Geurts, L. S., Cooke, J. R. H., van Bergen, R. S., & Jehee, J. F. M. (2022). Subjective confidence reflects representation of Bayesian probability in cortex. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *6*(2), 294–305. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01247-w

Girshick, A. R., Landy, M. S., & Simoncelli, E. P. (2011). Cardinal rules: Visual orientation perception reflects knowledge of environmental statistics. *Nature Neuroscience*, *14*(7), 926–932. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2831

Gottesman, J., Rubin, G. S., & Legge, G. E. (1981). A power law for perceived contrast in human vision. *Vision Research*, *21*(6), 791–799. https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6989(81)90176-0

Green, D. M., & Swets, J. A. (1966). *Signal detection theory and psychophysics* (pp. xi, 455). John Wiley.

Greenwald, A. G. (1992). New Look 3: Unconscious cognition reclaimed. *American Psychologist*, *47*(6), 766–779. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.47.6.766

Greenwald, A. G., Draine, S. C., & Abrams, R. L. (1996). Three Cognitive Markers of Unconscious Semantic Activation. *Science*, *273*(5282), 1699–1702. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.273.5282.1699

Greenwald, A. G., Klinger, M. R., & Liu, T. J. (1989). Unconscious processing of dichoptically masked words. *Memory & Cognition*, *17*(1), 35–47. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03199555

Gregory, R. L. (1968). Visual Illusions. *SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN*.

Gronau, Q. F., Singmann, H., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2020). Bridgesampling: An R Package for Estimating Normalizing Constants. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *92*, 1–29. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v092.i10

Haaf, J. M., Klaassen, F., & Rouder, J. (2018). *Capturing Ordinal Theoretical Constraint in Psychological Science* [Preprint]. PsyArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/a4xu9

Haaf, J. M., Rhodes, S., Naveh-Benjamin, M., Sun, T., Snyder, H. K., & Rouder, J. N. (2021a). Revisiting the remember–know task: Replications of Gardiner and Java (1990). *Memory & Cognition*, *49*(1), 46–66. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-020-01073-x

Haaf, J. M., Rhodes, S., Naveh-Benjamin, M., Sun, T., Snyder, H. K., & Rouder,

J. N. (2021b). Revisiting the remember–know task: Replications of Gardiner and Java (1990). *Memory & Cognition*, *49*(1), 46–66. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-020-01073-x

Hanks, T. D., Mazurek, M. E., Kiani, R., Hopp, E., & Shadlen, M. N. (2011). Elapsed Decision Time Affects the Weighting of Prior Probability in a Perceptual Decision Task. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *31*(17), 6339–6352. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5613-10.2011

Hannula, D. E., Simons, D. J., & Cohen, N. J. (2005). Imaging implicit perception: Promise and pitfalls. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *6*(3), 247–255. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1630

Haselton, M. G., Nettle, D., & Andrews, P. W. (2015). The Evolution of Cognitive Bias. In D. M. Buss (Ed.), *The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology* (1st ed., pp. 724–746). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470939376.ch25

Helmholtz, H. von. (1867). *Handbuch der physiologischen Optik*. L. Voss.

Ho, M.-L., & Schwarzkopf, D. S. (2022). The human primary visual cortex (V1) encodes the perceived position of static but not moving objects. *Communications Biology*, *5*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-022-03136-y

Horowitz, T. S. (2017). Prevalence in Visual Search: From the Clinic to the Lab and Back Again. *Japanese Psychological Research*, *59*(2), 65–108. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12153

Iemi, L., & Busch, N. A. (2018). Moment-to-Moment Fluctuations in Neuronal Excitability Bias Subjective Perception Rather than Strategic Decision-Making. *eNeuro*, *5*(3). https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0430-17.2018

Itthipuripat, S., Wiwatphonthana, P., Sawetsuttipan, P., Chang, K.-Y., Störmer, V., Woodman, G., & Serences, J. (2022). *Dissociable neural mechanisms of selective visual information processing underlie the effects of attention on visual appearance and response bia*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2206947/v1

Jachs, B., Blanco, M. J., Grantham-Hill, S., & Soto, D. (2015). On the independence of visual awareness and metacognition: A signal detection theoretic analysis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *41*, 269–276. https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0000026

Jimenez, M., Prieto, A., Gómez, P., Hinojosa, J. A., & Montoro, P. R. (2023). Masked priming under the Bayesian microscope: Exploring the integration of local elements into global shape through Bayesian model comparison. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *115*, 103568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2023.103568

Jogan, M., & Stocker, A. A. (2014). A new two-alternative forced choice method for the unbiased characterization of perceptual bias and discriminability. *Journal of Vision*, *14*(3), 20. https://doi.org/10.1167/14.3.20

Kaernbach, C. (1991). Simple adaptive testing with the weighted up-down method. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *49*(3), 227–229. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03214307

Kahneman, D. (2003). A perspective on judgment and choice: Mapping bounded rationality. *American Psychologist*, *58*(9), 697–720. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.58.9.697

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1982). Variants of uncertainty. *Cognition*, *11*(2), 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(82)90023-3

Kiani, R., & Shadlen, M. N. (2009). Representation of Confidence Associated with a

Decision by Neurons in the Parietal Cortex. *Science*, *324*(5928), 759–764. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1169405

Kiefer, M., Frühauf, V., & Kammer, T. (2023). Subjective and objective measures of visual awareness converge. *PLOS ONE*, *18*(10), e0292438. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0292438

Kiefer, M., Harpaintner, M., Rohr, M., & Wentura, D. (2023). Assessing subjective prime awareness on a trial-by-trial basis interferes with masked semantic priming effects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *49*(2), 269–283. https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0001228

Kiefer, M., & Kammer, T. (2024). The Relation Between Subjective and Objective Measures of Visual Awareness: Current Evidence, Attempt of a Synthesis and Future Research Directions. *Journal of Cognition*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.381

King, J.-R., Pescetelli, N., & Dehaene, S. (2016). Brain Mechanisms Underlying the Brief Maintenance of Seen and Unseen Sensory Information. *Neuron*, *92*(5), 1122–1134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.10.051

Kingdom, F. A. A., & Prins, N. (2016). *Psychophysics: A practical introduction* (Second edition). Academic Press, an imprint of Elsevier.

Kloosterman, N. A., de Gee, J. W., Werkle-Bergner, M., Lindenberger, U., Garrett, D. D., & Fahrenfort, J. J. (2019). Humans strategically shift decision bias by flexibly adjusting sensory evidence accumulation. *eLife*, *8*, e37321. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.37321

Klugkist, I., Laudy, O., & Hoijtink, H. (2005). Inequality Constrained Analysis of Variance: A Bayesian Approach. *Psychological Methods*, *10*(4), 477–493. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.10.4.477

Koenderink, J. (2014). The All Seeing Eye? *Perception*, *43*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1068/p4301ed

Koenderink, J. (2017). Visual Illusions? In A. G. Shapiro & D. Todorovic (Eds.), *The Oxford Compendium of Visual Illusions* (p. 0). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199794607.003.0008

Kolb, F. C., & Braun, J. (1995). Blindsight in normal observers. *Nature*, *377*(6547), 336–338. https://doi.org/10.1038/377336a0

Kunimoto, C., Miller, J., & Pashler, H. (2001). Confidence and Accuracy of Near-Threshold Discrimination Responses. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *10*(3), 294–340. https://doi.org/10.1006/ccog.2000.0494

Lamy, D., Alon, L., Carmel, T., & Shalev, N. (2015). The role of conscious perception in attentional capture and object-file updating. *Psychological Science*, *26*(1), 48–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614556777

Lamy, D., Salti, M., & Bar-Haim, Y. (2009). Neural Correlates of Subjective Awareness and Unconscious Processing: An ERP Study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *21*(7), 1435–1446. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21064

Lau, H. C., & Passingham, R. E. (2006). Relative blindsight in normal observers and the neural correlate of visual consciousness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *103*(49), 18763–18768. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0607716103

Lebreton, M., Langdon, S., Slieker, M. J., Nooitgedacht, J. S., Goudriaan, A. E., Denys, D., van Holst, R. J., & Luigjes, J. (2018). Two sides of the same coin: Monetary incentives concurrently improve and bias confidence judgments. *Science*

Advances, *4*(5), eaaq0668. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaq0668

Leite, F. P., & Ratcliff, R. (2011). What cognitive processes drive response biases? A diffusion model analysis. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *6*(7), 37.

Linares, D., Aguilar-Lleyda, D., & López-Moliner, J. (2019). Decoupling sensory from decisional choice biases in perceptual decision making. *eLife*, *8*, e43994. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.43994

Locke, S. M., Gaffin-Cahn, E., Hosseinizaveh, N., Mamassian, P., & Landy, M. S. (2020). Priors and payoffs in confidence judgments. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *82*(6), 3158–3175. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-020-02018-x

Maddox, W. T., & Bohil, C. J. (1998). Base-rate and payoff effects in multidimensional perceptual categorization. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *24*(6), 1459–1482. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.24.6.1459

Maddox, W. T., & Bohil, C. J. (2000). Costs and benefits in perceptual categorization. *Memory & Cognition*, *28*(4), 597–615. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03201250

Maddox, W. T., & Dodd, J. L. (2001). On the relation between base-rate and cost-benefit learning in simulated medical diagnosis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *27*(6), 1367–1384. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.27.6.1367

Mamassian, P., & de Gardelle, V. (2021). Modeling perceptual confidence and the confidence forced-choice paradigm. *Psychological Review*. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000312

Manis, M., Dovalina, I., Avis, N. E., & Cardoze, S. (1980). Base rates can affect individual predictions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*, 231–248. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.231

Maniscalco, B., & Lau, H. (2010). Comparing signal detection models of perceptual decision confidence. *Journal of Vision*, *10*(7), 213–213. https://doi.org/10.1167/10.7.213

Maniscalco, B., & Lau, H. (2012). A signal detection theoretic approach for estimating metacognitive sensitivity from confidence ratings. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *21*(1), 422–430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2011.09.021

Martinez-Saito, M. (2022). Probing doors to visual awareness: Choice set, visibility, and confidence. *Visual Cognition*, *30*(6), 393–424. https://doi.org/10.1080/13506285.2022.2086333

Mattler, U. (2003). Priming of mental operations by masked stimuli. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *65*(2), 167–187. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03194793

Meeres, S. L., & Graves, R. E. (1990). Localization of unseen visual stimuli by humans with normal vision. *Neuropsychologia*, *28*(12), 1231–1237. https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932(90)90039-Q

Meijs, E. L., Mostert, P., Slagter, H. A., de Lange, F. P., & van Gaal, S. (2019). Exploring the role of expectations and stimulus relevance on stimulus-specific neural representations and conscious report. *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, *2019*(1), niz011. https://doi.org/10.1093/nc/niz011

Meijs, E. L., Slagter, H. A., Lange, F. P. de, & Gaal, S. van. (2018). Dynamic Interactions between Top–Down Expectations and Conscious Awareness. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *38*(9), 2318–2327. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1952-17.2017

Merikle, P. M. (1992). Perception without awareness: Critical issues. *American*

Psychologist, *47*(6), 792–795. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.47.6.792

Merikle, P. M., & Reingold, E. M. (1998). On demonstrating unconscious perception: Comment on Draine and Greenwald (1998). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *127*(3), 304–310. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.127.3.304

Meyniel, F., Sigman, M., & Mainen, Z. F. (2015). Confidence as Bayesian Probability: From Neural Origins to Behavior. *Neuron*, *88*(1), 78–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.039

Michel, M. (2023). Confidence in consciousness research. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews. Cognitive Science*, *14*(2), e1628. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1628

Michel, M., & Lau, H. (2021). Is blindsight possible under signal detection theory? Comment on Phillips (2021). *Psychological Review*, *128*(3), 585–591. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000266

Min, Y., & Agresti, A. (2005). Random effect models for repeated measures of zero-inflated count data. *Statistical Modelling*, *5*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1191/1471082X05st084oa

Morales, J., & Lau, H. (2021). *Confidence tracks consciousness*.

Morales, J., Odegaard, B., & Maniscalco, B. (2022). The neural substrates of conscious perception without performance confounds. *Neuroscience and Philosophy*, 285.

Morey, R. D., & Rouder, J. N. (2018). *BayesFactor: Computation of Bayes Factors for Common Designs*.

Morey, R. D., & Rouder, J. N. (2024). *BayesFactor: Computation of bayes factors for common designs* [Manual].

Morgan, M. J., Hole, G. J., & Glennerster, A. (1990). Biases and sensitivities in geometrical illusions. *Vision Research*, *30*(11), 1793–1810. https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6989(90)90160-M

Morgan, M. J., Melmoth, D., & Solomon, J. A. (2013). Linking hypotheses underlying Class A and Class B methods. *Visual Neuroscience*, *30*(5-6), 197–206. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095252381300045X

Morgan, M., Dillenburger, B., Raphael, S., & Solomon, J. A. (2012). Observers can voluntarily shift their psychometric functions without losing sensitivity. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *74*(1), 185–193. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-011-0222-7

Müller-Lyer, F. C. (1889). Optische urteilstäuschungen. *Archiv für Anatomie Und Physiologie, Physiologische Abteilung*, *2*(Supplement), 263–270.

Nagel, T. (1974). What is It Like to Be a Bat? *Philosophical Review*, *83*(4), 435–450. https://doi.org/10.2307/2183914

Nelson, T. O. (1984). A comparison of current measures of the accuracy of feeling-of-knowing predictions. *Psychological Bulletin*, *95*, 109–133. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.1.109

Newell, B. R., & Shanks, D. R. (2014). Unconscious influences on decision making: A critical review. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *37*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X12003214

Overgaard, M., Rote, J., Mouridsen, K., & Ramsøy, T. Z. (2006). Is conscious perception gradual or dichotomous? A comparison of report methodologies during a visual task. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *15*(4), 700–708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2006.04.002

Overgaard, M., & Sandberg, K. (2021). The Perceptual Awareness Scale—recent controversies and debates. *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, *2021*(1), niab044. https://doi.org/10.1093/nc/niab044

Peirce, J., Gray, J. R., Simpson, S., MacAskill, M., Höchenberger, R., Sogo, H., Kastman, E., & Lindeløv, J. K. (2019). PsychoPy2: Experiments in behavior made easy. *Behavior Research Methods*, *51*(1), 195–203. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-01193-y

Pereira, M., Megevand, P., Tan, M. X., Chang, W., Wang, S., Rezai, A., Seeck, M., Corniola, M., Momjian, S., Bernasconi, F., Blanke, O., & Faivre, N. (2021). Evidence accumulation relates to perceptual consciousness and monitoring. *Nature Communications*, *12*(1), 3261. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23540-y

Peremen, Z., & Lamy, D. (2014). Do conscious perception and unconscious processing rely on independent mechanisms? A meta-contrast study. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *24*, 22–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2013.12.006

Persaud, N., & McLeod, P. (2008). Wagering demonstrates subconscious processing in a binary exclusion task. *Consciousness and Cognition: An International Journal*, *17*(3), 565–575. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2007.05.003

Persaud, N., McLeod, P., & Cowey, A. (2007). Post-decision wagering objectively measures awareness. *Nature Neuroscience*, *10*(2), 257–261. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1840

Peters, M. A. K., & Lau, H. (2015). Human observers have optimal introspective access to perceptual processes even for visually masked stimuli. *eLife*, *4*, e09651. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.09651

Peters, M. A. K., Ro, T., & Lau, H. (2016). Who's afraid of response bias? *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, *2016*(1), niw001. https://doi.org/10.1093/nc/niw001

Peters, M. A. K., Thesen, T., Ko, Y. D., Maniscalco, B., Carlson, C., Davidson, M., Doyle, W., Kuzniecky, R., Devinsky, O., Halgren, E., & Lau, H. (2017). Perceptual confidence neglects decision-incongruent evidence in the brain. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *1*(7), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0139

Phillips, I. (2021). Blindsight is qualitatively degraded conscious vision. *Psychological Review*, *128*(3), 558–584. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000254

Pinto, Y., van Gaal, S., de Lange, F. P., Lamme, V. A. F., & Seth, A. K. (2015). Expectations accelerate entry of visual stimuli into awareness. *Journal of Vision*, *15*(8), 13. https://doi.org/10.1167/15.8.13

Pleskac, T. J., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2010). Two-stage dynamic signal detection: A theory of choice, decision time, and confidence. *Psychological Review*, *117*, 864–901. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019737

Pöppel, E., Held, R., & Frost, D. (1973). Residual Visual Function after Brain Wounds involving the Central Visual Pathways in Man. *Nature*, *243*(5405), 295–296. https://doi.org/10.1038/243295a0

Press, C., Kok, P., & Yon, D. (2020). The Perceptual Prediction Paradox. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *24*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.11.003

Rahnev, D., & Denison, R. N. (2018). Suboptimality in perceptual decision making. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *41*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X18000936

Rahnev, D., Koizumi, A., McCurdy, L. Y., D'Esposito, M., & Lau, H. (2015). Confidence Leak in Perceptual Decision Making. *Psychological Science*, *26*(11), 1664–1680. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615595037

Ramsøy, T. Z., & Overgaard, M. (2004). Introspection and subliminal perception. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, *3*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:PHEN.0000041900.30172.e8

Raslear, T. G. (1985). Perceptual bias and response bias in temporal bisection. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *38*(3), 261–268. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03207153

Ratcliff, R. (1978). A theory of memory retrieval. *Psychological Review*, *85*(2), 59–108. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.85.2.59

Ratcliff, R. (1985). Theoretical interpretations of the speed and accuracy of positive and negative responses. *Psychological Review*, *92*(2), 212–225. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.92.2.212

Ratcliff, R. (2002). A diffusion model account of response time and accuracy in a brightness discrimination task: Fitting real data and failing to fit fake but plausible data. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *9*(2), 278–291. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196283

Ratcliff, R., & McKoon, G. (2008). The Diffusion Decision Model: Theory and Data for Two-Choice Decision Tasks. *Neural Computation*, *20*(4), 873–922. https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.2008.12-06-420

Ratcliff, R., Van Zandt, T., & McKoon, G. (1999). Connectionist and diffusion models of reaction time. *Psychological Review*, *106*(2), 261–300. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.106.2.261

Reingold, E. M., & Merikle, P. M. (1988). Using direct and indirect measures to study perception without awareness. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *44*(6), 563–575. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03207490

Reingold, E. M., & Merikle, P. M. (1990). On the Inter-relatedness of Theory and Measurement in the Study of Unconscious Processes. *Mind & Language*, *5*(1), 9–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0017.1990.tb00150.x

Restle, F., & Decker, J. (1977). Size of the Mueller-Lyer illusion as a function of its dimensions: Theory and data. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *21*(6), 489–503. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03198729

Robichaud, L., & Stelmach, L. B. (2003). Inducing blindsight in normal observers. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *10*(1), 206–209. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196486

Robinson, J. O. (2013). *The Psychology of Visual Illusion*. Courier Corporation.

Rossum, G. van, Drake, F. L., & Van Rossum, G. (2010). *The Python language reference* (Release 3.0.1 [Repr.]). Python Software Foundation.

Rothlein, D., DeGutis, J., & Esterman, M. (2018). Attentional Fluctuations Influence the Neural Fidelity and Connectivity of Stimulus Representations. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *30*(9), 1209–1228. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01306

Rouder, J. N. (2014). Optional stopping: No problem for Bayesians. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *21*(2), 301–308. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-014-0595-4

Rouder, J. N., Haaf, J. M., & Aust, F. (2018). From theories to models to predictions: A Bayesian model comparison approach. *Communication Monographs*, *85*(1), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2017.1394581

Rouder, J. N., Morey, R. D., Speckman, P. L., & Province, J. M. (2012). Default Bayes factors for ANOVA designs. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, *56*(5), 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmp.2012.08.001

Rungratsameetaweemana, N., Itthipuripat, S., Salazar, A., & Serences, J. T. (2018).

Expectations Do Not Alter Early Sensory Processing during Perceptual Decision-Making. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *38*(24), 5632–5648. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3638-17.2018

Sahraie, A., Weiskrantz, L., Barbur, J., Simmons, A., Williams, S. C., & Brammer, M. J. (1997). Pattern of neuronal activity associated with conscious and unconscious processing of visual signals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *94*(17), 9406–9411.

Sánchez-Fuenzalida, N., & Fahrenfort, J. J. (2022). *Predictions and rewards affect decision making but not subjective experience*. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/PFE46

Sánchez-Fuenzalida, N., Van Gaal, S., Fleming, S. M., Haaf, J. M., & Fahrenfort, J. J. (2023a). Predictions and rewards affect decision-making but not subjective experience. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(44), e2220749120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2220749120

Sánchez-Fuenzalida, N., Van Gaal, S., Fleming, S., Haaf, J. M., & Fahrenfort, J. J. (2023b). *Confidence reports during perceptual decision making dissociate from changes in subjective experience*. OSF. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xa4fj

Sandberg, K., & Overgaard, M. (2015). Using the perceptual awareness scale (PAS). In M. Overgaard (Ed.), *Behavioral Methods in Consciousness Research* (pp. 181–196). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199688890.003.0011

Sandberg, K., Timmermans, B., Overgaard, M., & Cleeremans, A. (2010). Measuring consciousness: Is one measure better than the other? *Consciousness and Cognition: An International Journal*, *19*(4), 1069–1078. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2009.12.013

Schmack, K., Bosc, M., Ott, T., Sturgill, J. F., & Kepecs, A. (2021). Striatal dopamine mediates hallucination-like perception in mice. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *372*(6537), eabf4740. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf4740

Schmidt, T. (2015). Invisible Stimuli, Implicit Thresholds: Why Invisibility Judgments Cannot be Interpreted in Isolation. *Advances in Cognitive Psychology*, *11*(2), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.5709/acp-0169-3

Schmidt, T., & Vorberg, D. (2006). Criteria for unconscious cognition: Three types of dissociation. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *68*(3), 489–504. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193692

Schönbrodt, F. D., & Stefan, A. M. (2019). *BFDA: An R package for Bayes factor design analysis*.

Schönbrodt, F. D., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2018). Bayes factor design analysis: Planning for compelling evidence. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *25*(1), 128–142. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1230-y

Schwarz, W., & Reike, D. (2020). The Müller-Lyer line-length task interpreted as a conflict paradigm: A chronometric study and a diffusion account. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *82*(8), 4025–4037. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-020-02096-x

Schwiedrzik, C. M., Singer, W., & Melloni, L. (2011). Subjective and objective learning effects dissociate in space and in time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *108*(11), 4506–4511. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1009147108

Sergent, C., Baillet, S., & Dehaene, S. (2005). Timing of the brain events underlying

access to consciousness during the attentional blink. *Nature Neuroscience*, *8*(10), 1391–1400. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1549

Sergent, C., & Dehaene, S. (2004). Is Consciousness a Gradual Phenomenon?: Evidence for an All-or-None Bifurcation During the Attentional Blink. *Psychological Science*, *15*(11), 720–728. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00748.x

Seth, A. K. (2008). Post-decision wagering measures metacognitive content, not sensory consciousness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *17*(3), 981–983. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2007.05.008

Seth, A. K., Dienes, Z., Cleeremans, A., Overgaard, M., & Pessoa, L. (2008). Measuring consciousness: Relating behavioural and neurophysiological approaches. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *12*(8), 314–321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.04.008

Sherman, M. T., Seth, A. K., Barrett, A. B., & Kanai, R. (2015). Prior expectations facilitate metacognition for perceptual decision. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *35*, 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2015.04.015

Simen, P., Contreras, D., Buck, C., Hu, P., Holmes, P., & Cohen, J. D. (2009). Reward rate optimization in two-alternative decision making: Empirical tests of theoretical predictions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *35*(6), 1865–1897. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016926

Snodgrass, M., Bernat, E., & Shevrin, H. (2004). Unconscious perception at the objective detection threshold exists. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *66*(5), 888–895. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03194982

Soto, D., Mäntylä, T., & Silvanto, J. (2011). Working memory without consciousness. *Current Biology*, *21*(22), R912–R913. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.09.049

Soto, D., Sheikh, U. A., & Rosenthal, C. R. (2019). A Novel Framework for Unconscious Processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *23*(5), 372–376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.03.002

Stein, T., Kaiser, D., Fahrenfort, J. J., & Gaal, S. van. (2021). The human visual system differentially represents subjectively and objectively invisible stimuli. *PLOS Biology*, *19*(5), e3001241. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001241

Stein, T., Kaiser, D., & Hesselmann, G. (2016). Can working memory be nonconscious? *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, *2016*(1), niv011. https://doi.org/10.1093/nc/niv011

Stoerig, P., & Cowey, A. (1997). Blindsight in man and monkey. *Brain*, *120*(3), 535–559. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/120.3.535

Summerfield, C., & de Lange, F. P. (2014). Expectation in perceptual decision making: Neural and computational mechanisms. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, *15*(11), 745–756. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3838

Summerfield, C., & Koechlin, E. (2010). Economic Value Biases Uncertain Perceptual Choices in the Parietal and Prefrontal Cortices. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *4*.

Sun, J., & Perona, P. (1998). Where is the sun? *Nature Neuroscience*, *1*(3), 183–184. https://doi.org/10.1038/630

Thurstone, L. L. (1994). A law of comparative judgment. *Psychological Review*, *101*(2), 266–270. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.101.2.266

van Ravenzwaaij, D., Mulder, M., Tuerlinckx, F., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2012). Do the Dynamics of Prior Information Depend on Task Context? An Analysis of

Optimal Performance and an Empirical Test. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *3*, 132. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00132

van Vugt, B., Dagnino, B., Vartak, D., Safaai, H., Panzeri, S., Dehaene, S., & Roelfsema, P. R. (2018). The threshold for conscious report: Signal loss and response bias in visual and frontal cortex. *Science*, *360*(6388), 537–542. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aar7186

Vandenbroucke, A. R. E., Fahrenfort, J. J., Sligte, I. G., & Lamme, V. A. F. (2014). Seeing without Knowing: Neural Signatures of Perceptual Inference in the Absence of Report. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *26*(5), 955–969. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00530

Vorberg, D., Mattler, U., Heinecke, A., Schmidt, T., & Schwarzbach, J. (2003). Different time courses for visual perception and action priming. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *100*(10), 6275–6280. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0931489100

Wade, N. J. (2017). Early History of Illusions. In A. G. Shapiro & D. Todorovic (Eds.), *The Oxford Compendium of Visual Illusions* (p. 0). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199794607.003.0001

Wagenmakers, E.-J., Lodewyckx, T., Kuriyal, H., & Grasman, R. (2010). Bayesian hypothesis testing for psychologists: A tutorial on the Savage–Dickey method. *Cognitive Psychology*, *60*(3), 158–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2009.12.001

Wagenmakers, E.-J., Love, J., Marsman, M., Jamil, T., Ly, A., Verhagen, J., Selker, R., Gronau, Q. F., Dropmann, D., Boutin, B., Meerhoff, F., Knight, P., Raj, A., van Kesteren, E.-J., van Doorn, J., Šmíra, M., Epskamp, S., Etz, A., Matzke, D., ... Morey, R. D. (2018). Bayesian inference for psychology. Part II: Example applications with JASP. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *25*(1), 58–76. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1323-7

Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Liu, P., Di, M., Gong, Y., & Tan, M. (2017). The role of representation strength of the prime in subliminal visuomotor priming. *Experimental Psychology*, *64*(6), 422–431. https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000381

Weiskrantz, L., Barbur, J. L., & Sahraie, A. (1995). Parameters affecting conscious versus unconscious visual discrimination with damage to the visual cortex (V1). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *92*(13), 6122–6126.

White, A., Moreland, J., & Rolfs, M. (2022). Oculomotor freezing indicates conscious detection free of decision bias. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00465.2021

White, C., & Poldrack, R. (2014). Decomposing bias in different types of simple decisions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *40*(2), 385–398. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034851

Wiecki, T. V., Sofer, I., & Frank, M. J. (2013). HDDM: Hierarchical Bayesian estimation of the Drift-Diffusion Model in Python. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, *0*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2013.00014

Windey, B., Gevers, W., & Cleeremans, A. (2013). Subjective visibility depends on level of processing. *Cognition*, *129*(2), 404–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2013.07.012

Witt, J. K., Taylor, J. E. T., Sugovic, M., & Wixted, J. T. (2015). Signal Detection Measures Cannot Distinguish Perceptual Biases from Response Biases. *Percep-*

tion, *44*(3), 289–300. https://doi.org/10.1068/p7908

Wixted, J. T. (2020). The forgotten history of signal detection theory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *46*(2), 201–233. https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000732

Wolfe, J. M., Horowitz, T. S., & Kenner, N. M. (2005). Rare items often missed in visual searches. *Nature*, *435*(7041), 439–440. https://doi.org/10.1038/435439a

Wyart, V., Nobre, A. C., & Summerfield, C. (2012). Dissociable prior influences of signal probability and relevance on visual contrast sensitivity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*(9), 3593–3598. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1120118109

Yang, E., Brascamp, J., Kang, M.-S., & Blake, R. (2014). On the use of continuous flash suppression for the study of visual processing outside of awareness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *5*, 724. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00724

Yeung, N., & Summerfield, C. (2012). Metacognition in human decision-making: Confidence and error monitoring. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *367*(1594), 1310–1321. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2011.0416

Zamboni, E., Ledgeway, T., McGraw, P. V., & Schluppeck, D. (2016). Do perceptual biases emerge early or late in visual processing? Decision-biases in motion perception. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *283*(1833), 20160263. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.0263

Zylberberg, A., Wolpert, D. M., & Shadlen, M. N. (2018). Counterfactual Reasoning Underlies the Learning of Priors in Decision Making. *Neuron*, *99*(5), 1083–1097.e6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2018.07.035

Acknowledgements

The six years that led to this manuscript feel now like a haze full of deadlines, after-work drinks, evenings at the lab, homesickness, and many, many hours debugging code. But mostly, I remember the countless people I met along the way.

First, I want to thank the members of my committee: Prof. Clare Press, Prof. Heleen Slagter, Prof. Chris Olivers, Dr. Jan Willem de Gee, Dr. Ruth van Holst and Prof. Eric-Jan Wagenmakers, for taking the time to read my dissertation. Also, technically not in the committee, thank you, Steve, for being a wonderful and very thorough coauthor.

I also want to strongly thank Johannes and Simon for supporting me throughout the last 6-plus years. Anytime a person has asked me about what to look for in a supervisor when looking for a PhD I have answered: 'You should be sure your supervisor is not an asshole'. Being interested in the topic of your PhD is also important, but that will only get you so far, so you'd better check whether your potential boss is a good person. I didn't do my homework and knew very little about Johannes and Simon before starting my PhD. But luckily, I ended up with amazing supervisors, and more importantly, amazing people.

Johannes, I learned a ton working with you, and more importantly, I had a lot of fun, mostly because you are a great supervisor and a warm person. You gave me the space to try new things (maybe too many sometimes) while making sure my research was airtight. I also want to thank you for offering me the option to keep working together by doing a postdoc with you. I had a great time during my PhD, and that is in great part thanks to you. **Simon**, when people ask me why I came to Amsterdam or why I decided to study consciousness I usually tell them about that chat we had on a bench under a tree in Chile, in which I told you I knew nothing about consciousness or the brain, but that I would surely want to go to Amsterdam to do a PhD. I remember you said that was OK, that if I already knew, I wouldn't need to do a PhD. I am very thankful you took me in and made sure I was always comfortable in the lab, but also in the Netherlands.

Although all the people I've mentioned so far had a great deal of importance, it is the people of the conscious brain lab (CBL) with whom I spent most of the time. They are all, one way or another, enablers, supporters, collaborators, sometimes saboteurs, but mostly friends. **Valeria**, I am not sure if you will read this. I want to thank you for being my first friend in Amsterdam, for showing me around and for inviting me to all sorts of random and obscure events. **Samuel**, thank you for being the best office mate I could have wished for. I enjoyed our long discussions about what the correct way of protesting is, and yes, sometimes about nerd stuff like our research. It was also very nice to be neighbours for some time. Together, it was surely easier to survive the PhD years. **Stijn**, thank you for being there for a drink and for explaining obscure details of the Dutch culture. Mostly, thank you for being a good friend. **Lola**, I enjoyed the last part of my PhD and postdoc during which we slowly became the senior postdocs of the lab. It is nice to know that every week we'll have a nice coffee to talk about life. I'm glad you are my friend. **Vlada**, thank you for first helping me with one of my endless data collections, and then for becoming my friend. I am happy it is you and me, and not only me, the ones who moved to the VU. **Philippa**, not strictly CBL but very strictly my friend. Thank you for being there to be picked up for coffee. Also, thanks for coming back from Australia, so we could keep on hanging out. **Jessica**, also not CBL but indeed a friend, thank you for feeding Philippa and

me unnecessarily high amounts of chilli oil. Thanks also to the most recent additions to the CBL gang, **Timo**, **Sean**, **Margot**, **Ivan** and **Ana-Maria**, lab meetings are more lively than when I first started my PhD. Besides the people of the CBL, I also want to thank all the students who contributed to my research in one way or another, with special thanks to **James S.**, **Wieger** and **Paulo**.

I also want to thank other people who made me feel at home at work and welcomed me at UvA. **Marte**, **Yair**, **Hilde**, **Maria-Chiara**, **Tommaso**, **Carolien**, **Iris**, **Ettore**, **Peter**, **Helma**, **Liljian**, **Noor**, **Esperanza**, **Mana**, **Nick**, **Lynn**, **Leon** and **Elsa**. These names are in no particular order, so you better not read into that 8-). **Ana Pinho**, I'm glad I took those Dutch courses, not particularly for the learning but because I met you there. I also want to thank my new colleagues at the VU. The final sprint towards this book happened mostly there. Thank you, **Chris**, for being a great office mate, and a Bayesian and ggplot ally. **Caterina**, thank you for being a very caring office mate. Thank you, **Kirsten**, **Zurey** and **Ines** for being great office mates and for putting the name of our office high in the annals of fuss-ball. Thanks, **Elle**, for becoming the first Fussball champion of the department with me. Thank you, **Heelen**, **Maša**, **Chris O.**, **Litian**, **Baiwei**, **Anna**, **Mathias**, **Sander**, **Joshua**, **Docky**, **Ningkai** for making me feel welcomed.

También quiero agradecer a un montón de gente que me apoyo no desde la universidad, sino fuera de ella o incluso desde Chile. **Andrea**, **Valentina**, **Jouke**, **Emmerson**, **Carlos**, **Mona**, **Andrés** y **Nacha**, gracias por ser los amigos chilenos y venezolano que necesitaba para no echar tanto de menos latinoamerica. **Fernando**, **Pablo**, **Camila**, **Pia**, **Caro**, **Isa**, **Feña**, **Seba**, **David**, **Claudio**, **Nacho** y **Rene**, **Ligia**, **Dani** y **Pancho**, gracias por recibirme una vez al año y por hacerme sentir que el tiempo no ha pasado, a pesar de que han sido ya 6 años. **Gorka**, **Alvaro** y **Huepe**, gracias por aceptarme en el CSCN, por contribuir en mi formación temprana, y gracias por convencer a **Simon** para que me trajera a Amsterdam.

If I missed anyone, I'm sorry. This book was finished a mere month before my defence. Very in character.

Por supuesto, nada de esto hubiese sido posible si mi familia no me hubiese apoyado y motivado a perseguir lo que sea que me hiciera feliz. Se que no es fácil dejar ir a tu hijo, nieto o sobrino a otro continente y tener que confortare con verlo una vez por año. No fue fácil para mi tampoco. Pero hubiese sido aun más difícil si no hubiese sentido el apoyo de mi familia. **Vivian**, **Lola**, **Tata**, **Enri**, **Anny**, este doctorado es un logro mio tanto como tuyo.

Lucija, there is a lot I could write, but I will be brief. Thank you for being in my life, and thank you for being my biggest supporter (and opponent when needed). Thank you for loving me and taking care of me when I needed it, but also when I couldn't say I needed it. You made the chaotic end of my PhD (and my life) a much more pleasant and happy time. I also want to thank Loki, although she cannot read it. Maybe science will bring us that far someday.

Lastly, I want to thank me. I want to thank me for believing in me. I want to thank me for doing all this hard work. I want to thank me for also taking days off. But mostly, I want to thank me for never quitting.