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Supplementary Table 1

*Summary of Methods for Classifying ‘Imitators’ in Studies of Macaque Neonatal Imitation*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Study and sub-sample1 | Authors’ ‘imitator’ criteria | Authors’ classification of ‘imitators’ |
| Ferrari et al. [22]  N = 21 | N/A (this study did not differentiate between ‘imitators’ and ‘non-imitators’) | N/A |
| Ferrari et al. [23]  N = 36 | **Method A:**  Displayed gesture in the matching condition stimulus period more than during the baseline period for >50% of testing sessions (up to four sessions total) | **TP2:** 21 imitators, 15 non-imitators  **LPS3:** 20 imitators, 16 non-imitators |
| Paukner et al. [24]  N = 60 | **Method B:**  (1) Displayed LPS in the matching condition more than during the baseline, AND (2) increase in LPS from baseline to stimulus period was greater for the matching condition than the control condition (rotating disc) | **TP:** not reported  **LPS:** 33 imitators, 27 non-imitators |
| Simpson et al. [25]  N = 90 | **Method C:**  Positive *Imitation Index*: i.e., positive difference between (i) increase in gesture from baseline to stimulus period in the matching condition, and (ii) increase in gesture from baseline to stimulus period in the control condition (rotating disc) | Numbers of infants with positive and negative Imitation Index scores not reported, but these can be obtained from inspection of *Figure 2*:  **TP:** 46 imitators, 44 non-imitators  **LPS:** 52 imitators, 38 non-imitators |
| Paukner et al. [26]  N = 37 | **Method B:**  (1) Displayed gesture (TP/LPS) in the matching condition more than during the baseline, AND (2) increase in gesture from baseline to stimulus period was greater for the matching condition than the control condition (rotating disc) | **TP:** 15 imitators, 22 non-imitators  **LPS:** 16 imitators, 21 non-imitators |
| Simpson et al. [27]  N = 49 | **Method C:**  Positive Imitation Index for LPS (with rotating disc control) | **TP:** not reported  **LPS:** 27 imitators, 22 non-imitators |
| Simpson et al. [28]  N = 119 | **Method C:**  Positive Imitation Index for LPS (with rotating disc control) | **TP:** not reported  **LPS:** 61 imitators, 58 non-imitators |
| Kaburu et al. [29]  N = 126 | **Method B:**  (1) Displayed LPS in the matched condition more than during the baseline, AND (2) increase in LPS from baseline to stimulus period was greater for the LPS condition than the control condition (rotating disc) | **TP:** not reported  **LPS:** 58 imitators, 68 non-imitators |
| Paukner et al. [30]  N = 163 | **Method B:**  (1) Displayed gesture (TP/LPS) in the matching condition more than during the baseline, AND (2) increase in gesture from baseline to stimulus period was greater for the matching condition than the control condition (rotating disc) | **TP:** 49 imitators, 87 non-imitators  **LPS:** 79 imitators, 84 non-imitators |
| Wooddell et al. [31]  N = 19 | **Method C:**  Positive Imitation Index for TP/LPS (with rotating disc control) | Numbers of infants with positive and negative Imitation Index scores not reported, but these can be obtained from inspection of *Figure 1*:  **Unclear4:** 11 imitators, 8 non-imitators |

1 According to Paukner et al. [30] (and correspondence with the authors), all of these sub-samples were in fact part of a single full sample of 163 infants. This appears to include the original sample from Ferrari et al. [22], whose data were incorporated into Ferrari et al.’s [23] sample.

2 TP = tongue protrusion. 3 LPS = lipsmacking.

4 This study does not appear to indicate whether the ‘imitators’ were for the TP or LPS action.

Supplementary Table 2

*Intra-Individual Consistency Correlations for the Tongue Protrusion Imitation Index*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1-2 days | 3-4 days | 5-6 days | 7-8 days |
| 1-2 days | - | .04 | .05 | .01 |
| 3-4 days |  | - | -.01 | .09 |
| 5-6 days |  |  | - | -.04 |
| 7-8 days |  |  |  | - |

*Note.* The average correlation is not significantly different from zero, mean *r* = .02, *t*(5) = 1.18, *p* = .291.

Supplementary Table 3

*Intra-Individual Consistency Correlations for the Lipsmacking Imitation Index*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1-2 days | 3-4 days | 5-6 days | 7-8 days |
| 1-2 days | - | .11 | .10 | -.05 |
| 3-4 days |  | - | .32 | -.08 |
| 5-6 days |  |  | - | -.21 |
| 7-8 days |  |  |  | - |

*Note.* The average correlation is not significantly different from zero, mean *r* = .03, *t*(5) = 0.41, *p* = .699.