

*Supplementary Figure 1.* Sorting and pair matching procedure. 1a. In one experimental design (used in Experiments 3, 5 and 8), items were rank ordered based on initial preferences evaluation procedure, and classified as high value (ranks 7:22) and low value items (39:54). 1b. Eight high and eight low value items were associated with the cue and response during training (assigned to be Go items). In the probe phase, all eight Go items were paired with similar-value No-Go items, forming 64 (8×8) unique pairs in each value category. 1c. In a second experimental design (used in Experiments 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9) similar rank ordering was conducted. Items were classified as high value (7:18) and low value items (43:54). 1d. Six high value and six low value items assigned to be Go items during training. In the probe phase, all six Go items were paired with similar initial value No-Go items, forming 36 (6×6) unique pairs in each value category. Condition assignments for Go and No-Go items were counterbalanced across participants in both experimental designs.

**%% Neutral auditory cue**

% features:

wave = sin(1:0.25:1000);

freq = 22254;

% Play the sound

sound(wave,freq);

**%% Aversive auditory cue**

% features:

wave = cot(1:0.25:7541);

freq = 100544;

% Play the sound

sound(wave,freq);

**Supplementary Code.** Neutral and aversive auditory cues, implemented in MATLAB.

In Experiments 3, 5 and 7-9 a neutral auditory cue of 180-ms was produced using a sinus wave function. To induce aversive auditory cue in Experiment 2, a longer duration of 300-ms cotangent wave function was used.