Figures and figure supplements

A causal role for right temporo-parietal junction in signaling moral conflict

Ignacio Obeso et al
Figure 1. Donation task. (A) Presentation of moral context and public trial conditions, with green leaf logo from ‘Bread for all’ organization; (B) presentation of immoral context and private trial conditions, showing the ‘Lewas’ organization logo. (C) It shows the trial distribution of the moral context and D the trial distribution of the immoral context.
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Figure 1—figure supplement 1. Subjects value rating of organization types used in the donation task. Every participant rated both organizations based on familiarity ("How much do you understand and are familiar with the organization?"), monetary implication ("Will you contribute with your own money for the organization profit?"), personal implication ("Will you use your own resources (personal time, effort, participate in activities, publicity...) to help the organization?"), empathy ("How attached or close you feel to the organization?") and friend’s empathy ("How attached or close do you think your friends will be to the organization?").
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.40671.003
Figure 1—figure supplement 2. Audience effects are not changed by TMS. For both stimulation groups, public versus private choices led to similar increased donations to the good organization and similar decreased donations to the bad organization. The audience effect was obtained by subtracting the number of accepted choices in the public minus the private context, separately for each organization type and stimulation group. While an Audience effect was found in the full regression model (Audience coefficient = 0.51; p = 0.043), no Group x Audience interaction was found (Audience x cTBS coefficient = 0.04; p = 0.78).
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**Figure 1—figure supplement 3.** Reaction times for the different conditions show no significant differences [all F’s > 1], suggesting that TMS did not lead to task disengagement or distraction.
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Figure 2. Color-coded map for probability of acceptance to donate (warm color shows greater acceptance probability, cold color lower acceptance probability) for the good organization in the control group (vertex) and TPJ group. Trials relative to both audience conditions (public/private) are shown. The black line represents the control group’s responses at which donations were accepted with 50% probability for each given cost level. Vertical bar indicates the number of times a response was selected, that is one per subject.
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Figure 2—figure supplement 1. Behaviour of individual subjects for the TPJ group and each organization type (good vs bad).
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Figure 2—figure supplement 2. Behavior of individual subjects for the Vertex group and each organization type (good vs bad).
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Figure 3. Color-coded map for probability of acceptance to donate (warm color shows greater acceptance probability; cold color lower acceptance probability) for the bad organization in the control group (vertex) and TPJ group. Trials relative to both audience conditions (public/private) are shown. The black line represents the control group’s responses at which donations were accepted with 50% probability for each given cost level. Vertical bar indicates the number of times a response was selected, that is one per subject.
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