

S2 Table. Presenting the summary of the analyses reporting relevant beta and F statistics.

Paper	Analyses	Factors/predictors included in analyses	Results
Newman et al., 2010	GLM DV: Fear potentiated startle	Condition: threat focus, alternative low load focus, alternative high load focus PCL-R Total Condition: threat focus, alternative low load focus, alternative high load focus PCL-R Factors	Significant interaction between fear potentiated startle and focus of attention (threat vs alternative focus) in psychopathic individuals. Psychopathy inversely associated with fear potentiated startle in the alternative focus condition. Psychopathy is not associated high load (high vs low). Factor 1 inversely associated with fear potentiated startle in the alternative focus condition. Factor 2 not reported (authors note Factor 2 performed similarly to Factor 1 in this analysis, but there is no numerical data).
Baskin-Sommers et al., 2013	GLM DV: startle response	Valence: pleasant, neutral, unpleasant Familiarity: familiar vs novel PCL-R Total score Valence: pleasant, neutral, unpleasant Familiarity: familiar vs novel PCL-R Factors	Psychopathic individuals display deficient emotion-modulated startle for novel stimuli only. Factor 2 is associated with deficient emotion-modulated startle for novel stimuli, suggesting their deficit is more general to emotion processing (including pleasant and unpleasant stimuli). Factor 1 specifically show a deficit for fear (unpleasant pictures), with magnitude of unpleasant vs neutral contrast decreasing as Factor 1 scores increase.
Venables et al., 2015	GLM DV: Late positive potential	Valence: pleasant, neutral, aversive PCL-R Factors	Neither psychopathy factor displayed a significant main effect. There was a significant Factor 1 X valence interaction, lesser augmentation of LPP for aversive versus pleasant pictures with increasing levels of PCL-R Factor 1.

	(electrocortical response)		No Factor 2 X Valence interaction.
Baskin-Sommers et al., 2011a	GLM DV: Fear potentiated startle	Focus: alternative vs threat Timing of attentional cue: Early vs late PCL-R Total Focus: alternative vs threat Timing of attentional cue: Early vs late PCL-R Factors	Psychopathy was significantly inversely related to FPS in the early alternative focus condition (high psychopathy scores are associated with decreasing FPS only when attention is engaged for an alternative task prior to presentation of threat-relevant information). Both Factor 1 and Factor 2 interacted significantly with the early alternative focus condition, replicating results for total scores. Significant main effect for Factor 1 – high factor 1 scores are associated with decreased FPS in all conditions.
Casey et al., 2013	Bivariate correlations, step-wise regression DV: Heart rate	PCL-R Factor 1 Years of education Risk score (HCR20) PCL-R Total PCL-R Factor 2	Significant predictors: Factor 1 Variance explained: 26% For every 1 point increase in Factor 1, increased heart rate when experiencing negative pictures will be smaller by approximately half a beat per minute.
Baskin-Sommers et al., 2011b	GLM DV: Fear potentiated startle	Focus: threat vs alternative Attentional load: high vs low PCL-R Total Focus: threat vs alternative Attentional load: high vs low PCL-R Factors	No significant results. Factor 1 significantly associated with diminished FPS.
Tillem et al., 2016	GLM	Valence: pleasant, neutral, unpleasant Familiarity: familiar vs novel	Lower response to unpleasant vs pleasant novel pictures; higher response to unpleasant vs pleasant familiar pictures.

	DV: theta phase coherence (EEG measure, readiness to perceive and integrate sensory inputs)	PCL-R Total Valence: pleasant, neutral, unpleasant Familiarity: familiar vs novel PCL-R Factors	Factor 1 is associated with higher coherence during unpleasant vs pleasant familiar stimuli. Factor 2 is associated with higher coherence in response to affective (both pleasant and unpleasant pictures) compared to neutral during novel trials.
--	---	--	--