

A meta-analysis of correction effects in science-relevant misinformation

In the format provided by the
authors and unedited

Supplementary Information

Statistical Procedure

We first imputed the misinformation effect sizes using two *R* packages – *Amelia* version 1.8.0¹ and *mice* version 3.14.0². We next used two sets of imputed values and the original data (i.e., with missingness) to perform three separate regression models of the misinformation effects regressing on the correction effects and misinformation-persistence effects. We then compared the coefficients of these regression models to evaluate the performance of the imputed values. Supplementary Table 4 shows the coefficient estimates of the intercept, the correction effects, and the misinformation persistence. The coefficients using *Amelia* (see the second column of Supplementary Table 4) were more similar to the estimates of the model using the dataset with missing data (see the last column of Supplementary Table 4). Therefore, we decided to include *Amelia*'s imputed values to calculate an aggregate mean of the imputed misinformation effect sizes and perform the following supplementary analyses.

Meta-Regression

We repeated the meta-regression analysis of the same eight moderators (see Supplementary Table 5). The influences of the moderators on the debunking effects remained the same. Misinformation that was negative, fictitious, and non-health related was easier to correct. Corrections were more efficacious when they were detailed, when the recipients were likely familiar with the topic, and when the issue was not politically polarized.

Supplementary Table 1

Characteristics and Effect Sizes of Reports Included in Meta-Analysis

Study	Authors	Year	Exp erim ent Num ber	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i> (impu ted)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Nega tive misi nfor mati on	Dom ain of misi nfor mati on	Fictiti ous issue	Det aile d corr ecti on	In- pers on corr ectio n	Attitu dinal conge niality	Lik ely fa mil iari ty	Iss ue pol ari zati on	Stud y sam ple	La b con text	Met hod of ES calc ulat ion
1	Anderson Lepper Ross	1980	1	All	70		1.16	c	0.31	0.01	0.12	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
1	Anderson Lepper Ross	1980	1	All	70		1.16	mp	-1.18	0.02	0.16	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
2	Anderson Lepper Ross	1980	2	No explanation condition	30	3.01	3.01	mp	-1.18	0.06	0.24	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
2	Anderson Lepper Ross	1980	2	Explanation condition	30		3.25	mp	-2.24	0.13	0.36	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
3	Anderson	1982	1	One sided- No exp & Explain 1 side	44		0.99	mp	-1.27	0.04	0.21	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
3	Anderson	1982	1	Explain both given and alternate (2 collapsed conds-- innoc & counterexp)	44		1.75	mp	-0.55	0.03	0.16	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
4	Anderson	1983	1	Concrete, Session 2	86		1.30	mp	-1.22	0.02	0.14	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
4	Anderson	1983	1	Abstract, Session 2	86		1.19	mp	-0.27	0.01	0.11	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
4	Anderson	1983	1	Concrete information format, Session 1, Collapsed Explanation cond (same for 3 below)	49		2.38	mp	-1.14	0.03	0.19	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
4	Anderson	1983	1	Abstract, Session 1	49		2.14	mp	-0.44	0.02	0.15	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
5	Anderson New Speer	1985	1	Pos v Neg only.	80		1.76	mp	-1.11	0.02	0.14	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
6	Davies#	1997	1	self-generated explanation, pos v neg	48		1.96	mp	-2.27	0.08	0.28	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
6	Davies#	1997	1	other-generated explanation, pos v neg	48		1.48	mp	-0.78	0.03	0.17	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
6	Davies#	1997	1	no explanation, pos v neg	48		1.14	mp	-0.38	0.02	0.15	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detected correction	In-person correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
7	Davies#	1997	2	no explanation, pos v neg other-generated	24		6.31	mp	-7.00	1.23	1.11	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
7	Davies#	1997	2	explanation, pos v neg self-generated	25		2.05	mp	-1.07	0.07	0.26	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
7	Davies#	1997	2	explanation, pos v neg	26		2.13	mp	-2.62	0.19	0.44	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
8	Golding Fowler Long Latta	1990	1	Mistake retraction	60	1.91	1.91	c	1.79	0.04	0.21	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
8	Golding Fowler Long Latta	1990	1	Mistake retraction	60	1.91	1.91	mp	-0.12	0.02	0.13	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
9	Golding Fowler Long Latta	1990	2	Mistake retraction	60	1.43	1.43	c	1.40	0.03	0.18	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
9	Golding Fowler Long Latta	1990	2	Mistake retraction	60	1.43	1.43	mp	-0.02	0.02	0.13	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
10	Green Donahue	2011	1	Accidental error retraction	68.5	0.69	0.69	c	0.12	0.01	0.12	2	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
10	Green Donahue	2011	1	Intentional fabrication retraction	68.5	0.69	0.69	c	0.20	0.01	0.12	2	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
10	Green Donahue	2011	1	Accidental error retraction	68.5	0.69	0.69	mp	-0.55	0.02	0.13	2	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
10	Green Donahue	2011	1	Intentional fabrication retraction	68.5	0.69	0.69	mp	-0.46	0.02	0.13	2	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
11	Greitemeyer	2014	1	All	158	0.75	0.75	c	0.47	0.01	0.08	1	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
11	Greitemeyer	2014	1	All	158	0.75	0.75	mp	-0.38	0.01	0.08	1	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
12	Guenther & Alicke	2008	1	Negative Feedback/Fail	56.5	1.98	1.98	c	1.03	0.03	0.17	2	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
12	Guenther & Alicke	2008	1	Negative Feedback/Fail	56.5	1.98	1.98	mp	-0.32	0.02	0.14	2	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
13	Misra	1992	1	Conventional debrief, fail	31		1.79	mp	-0.81	0.04	0.21	2	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
13	Misra	1992	1	Explicit debrief, fail	31		0.73	mp	-0.35	0.03	0.18	2	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
14	Misra	1992	2	Conventional debrief	50		2.94	c	1.87	0.05	0.23	2	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1
14	Misra	1992	2	Explicit debrief	50		4.21	c	3.87	0.17	0.41	2	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1

Study	Authors	Year	Exp rim ent Num ber	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i> (impu ted)	Typ e of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Nega tive misi nfor mati on	Dom ain of misi nfor mati on	Fictiti ous issue	Det aile d corr ecti on	In- pers on corr ectio n	Attitu dinal conge niality	Lik ely fa mil iari ty	Iss ue pol ari zati on	Stud y sam ple	La b con tex t	Met hod of ES calc ulat ion
14	Misra	1992	2	Conventional debrief	50		2.94	mp	-1.06	0.03	0.18	2	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1
14	Misra	1992	2	Explicit debrief	50		4.21	mp	0.16	0.02	0.14	2	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1
15	Misra	1992	3	Conventional debrief	46.5		0.98	c	0.30	0.02	0.15	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1
15	Misra	1992	3	Explicit debrief	46.5		1.33	c	1.20	0.04	0.19	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1
15	Misra	1992	3	Conventional debrief	46.5		0.98	mp	-1.11	0.03	0.19	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1
15	Misra	1992	3	Explicit debrief	46.5		1.33	mp	-0.11	0.02	0.15	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1
16	Nestler	2010	1	2 reasons pos neg	20		2.67	mp	-1.80	0.15	0.39	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	2	2
16	Nestler	2010	1	Explanation, pos v neg	20		2.05	mp	-1.43	0.11	0.34	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	2	2
16	Nestler	2010	1	10 reasons pos neg	20		1.54	mp	-0.32	0.05	0.23	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	2	2
17	Nestler	2010	2	Explanation, pos v neg	22		2.09	mp	-1.21	0.09	0.29	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	2	2
17	Nestler	2010	2	2 counterfactual reasons pos v neg	26		1.59	mp	-0.69	0.05	0.22	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	2	2
17	Nestler	2010	2	10 counterfactual reasons pos v neg	25		3.10	mp	-3.36	0.30	0.55	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	2	2
18	Sherman and Kim	2002	1	Pos v neg	19	0.75	0.75	mp	-0.73	0.07	0.27	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
19	Sherman and Kim	2002	2	Pos v neg	22		1.00	mp	-0.58	0.06	0.24	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
20	Sherman and Kim	2002	3	Pos v neg	19	0.50	0.50	mp	-0.57	0.06	0.25	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
21	Sherman and Kim	2002	4	Pos v neg	18	0.59	0.59	mp	0.69	0.07	0.27	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	2
22	Christie Johnson Stoffer Wright	1996	1	Immediate debrief, pos v neg	40		1.79	mp	-1.23	0.05	0.21	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
22	Christie Johnson Stoffer Wright	1996	1	Delay cond debrief, pos v neg	40		0.96	mp	-0.94	0.04	0.19	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
22	Christie Johnson Stoffer	1996	1	Transcript cond debrief, pos v neg	40		0.60	mp	-0.27	0.03	0.16	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
22	Wright Christie	1996	1	Discussion cond debrief, pos v neg	154		0.65	mp	0.07	0.01	0.08	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detected correction	In-person correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
23	Johnson Stoffer Wright Christie Johnson Stoffer Wright	1996	2	Standard firefighter w delay Pos v neg	40		3.26	mp	-3.77	0.22	0.47	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
23	Johnson Stoffer Wright Christie Johnson Stoffer Wright	1996	2	Argument exposure Pos v Neg	40		0.45	mp	0.42	0.03	0.17	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
24	Johnson Stoffer Wright Christie Johnson Stoffer	1996	3	Standard firefighter, no delay, pos v neg	40		2.20	mp	-1.68	0.06	0.25	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
24	Johnson Stoffer Wright Christie Johnson Stoffer	1996	3	Standard firefighter, exposure to responses (not args), pos v neg	40		2.83	mp	-1.47	0.05	0.23	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	2
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Favorable trait, disregard first, immediate	102	1.14	1.14	c	1.26	0.02	0.13	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Unfavorable trait, disregard first, immediate	102	2.18	2.18	c	1.94	0.03	0.17	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Favorable trait, disregard last	102	1.10	1.10	c	0.80	0.01	0.11	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Unfavorable trait, disregard last	102	1.30	1.30	c	1.97	0.03	0.17	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Favorable trait, disregard first, delay	102		0.63	c	1.01	0.01	0.12	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Unfavorable trait, disregard first, delay	102		2.07	c	1.86	0.03	0.16	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Favorable trait, disregard first, immediate	102	1.14	1.14	mp	0.35	0.01	0.10	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Unfavorable trait, disregard first, immediate	102	2.18	2.18	mp	-0.25	0.01	0.10	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Favorable trait, disregard last	102	1.10	1.10	mp	-0.94	0.01	0.12	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detected correction	In-person correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Unfavorable trait, disregard last	102	1.30	1.30	mp	0.50	0.01	0.11	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Favorable trait, disregard first, delay	102		0.63	mp	-0.07	0.01	0.10	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	Wyer Budesheim	1987	1	Unfavorable trait, disregard first, delay	102		2.07	mp	-0.25	0.01	0.10	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Misinfo trait last	73	1.41	1.41	c	0.52	0.02	0.12	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Unkind traits first	36	2.43	2.43	c	3.12	0.16	0.40	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Honest traits first	36	2.41	2.41	c	2.46	0.11	0.33	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Unkind traits last	36	0.80	0.80	c	0.71	0.03	0.19	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Honest traits last	36	-0.42	-0.42	c	-0.15	0.03	0.17	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Misinfo trait first	72	2.28	2.28	c	2.18	0.05	0.22	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Misinfo trait last	73	1.41	1.41	mp	-0.89	0.02	0.14	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Unkind traits first	36	2.43	2.43	mp	0.69	0.03	0.19	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Honest traits first	36	2.41	2.41	mp	0.05	0.03	0.17	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Unkind traits last	36	0.80	0.80	mp	-0.10	0.03	0.17	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Honest traits last	36	-0.42	-0.42	mp	0.27	0.03	0.17	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
26	Wyer Unverzagt	1985	1	Misinfo trait first	72	2.28	2.28	mp	-0.11	0.01	0.12	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
27	De keersmaecker and Roets	2017	1	Retraction condition vs. control condition	390		0.37	mp	-0.05	0.00	0.05	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	2	1
28	Ecker and Ang	2019	1	Singular correction and left wing	40		4.32	c	3.70	0.19	0.44	1	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	-1	2	1	1
28	Ecker and Ang	2019	1	Singular correction and right wing	40		0.04	c	1.44	0.05	0.22	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detected correction	In-person correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
28	Ecker and Ang	2019	1	General correction and left wing	40		3.11	c	3.06	0.14	0.37	1	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	-1	2	1	1
28	Ecker and Ang	2019	1	General correction and right wing	40		0.76	c	-1.71	0.06	0.25	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1
29	Ecker and Ang	2019	2	Correction of left-wing party misconduct and left wing	40		3.15	c	4.41	0.26	0.51	1	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	-1	2	1	1
29	Ecker and Ang	2019	2	Correction of left-wing party misconduct and right wing	40		0.57	c	0.70	0.03	0.18	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1
29	Ecker and Ang	2019	2	Correction of right-wing party misconduct and left wing	40		2.35	c	2.53	0.10	0.32	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1
29	Ecker and Ang	2019	2	Correction of right-wing party misconduct and right wing	40		1.61	c	2.25	0.09	0.29	1	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	-1	2	1	1
30	Ecker and $\sqrt{1-10^{-6}}$ Ro dricks	2020	1	Descriptions of specific behaviors that a fictitious person had allegedly engaged in	142	2.84	2.84	c	3.02	0.04	0.20	2	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1
30	Ecker and $\sqrt{1-10^{-6}}$ Ro dricks	2020	1	Descriptions of specific behaviors that a fictitious person had allegedly engaged in	142	2.84	2.84	mp	0.12	0.01	0.08	2	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1
31	Ecker and $\sqrt{1-10^{-6}}$ Ro dricks	2020	2	Descriptions of specific behaviors that two fictitious persons had allegedly engaged	287	3.09	3.09	c	3.37	0.02	0.15	2	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1
31	Ecker and $\sqrt{1-10^{-6}}$ Ro dricks	2020	2	Descriptions of specific behaviors that two fictitious persons had	287	3.09	3.09	mp	0.28	0.00	0.06	2	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detailed correction	Impersonal correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
32	Sangalang, Ophir, & Cappella	2019	1	allegedly engaged Narrative corrections	385	-0.09	-0.09	c	0.17	0.00	0.05	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1
32	Sangalang, Ophir, & Cappella	2019	1	Narrative corrections	385	-0.09	-0.09	mp	0.27	0.00	0.05	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1
33	Sangalang, Ophir, & Cappella	2019	2	Simple correction vs. no correction	400		1.98	c	0.36	0.00	0.05	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1
33	Sangalang, Ophir, & Cappella	2019	2	Negative emotion correction vs. no correction	402		1.01	c	0.47	0.00	0.05	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1
34	Ecker, Sze, and Andreotta	2020	1	Worldview congruent - Republicans	113		1.85	c	0.66	0.01	0.10	1	1	1	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	2	1
34	Ecker, Sze, and Andreotta	2020	1	Worldview congruent - Democrats	115		1.04	c	0.73	0.01	0.10	1	1	1	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	2	1
34	Ecker, Sze, and Andreotta	2020	1	Worldview incongruent - Republicans	110		1.02	c	0.71	0.01	0.11	1	1	1	2	-1	1	-1	-1	1	2	1
34	Ecker, Sze, and Andreotta	2020	1	Worldview incongruent - Democrats	91		2.16	c	1.09	0.02	0.13	1	1	1	2	-1	1	-1	-1	1	2	1
35	Ferrero et al	2020	1	Correction with text-and-origin	135		2.60	c	1.38	0.01	0.12	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	2	2	2
35	Ferrero et al	2020	1	Correction with text alone	135		2.81	c	1.41	0.01	0.12	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	2	2	2
35	Ferrero et al	2020	1	Correction with no text	135		0.93	c	0.45	0.01	0.09	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	2	2	2
36	Ferrero et al	2020	2	Correction with text-and-origin	105		1.28	c	0.56	0.01	0.11	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	2	2	2
36	Ferrero et al	2020	2	Correction with text alone	105		1.75	c	0.41	0.01	0.10	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	2	2	2
36	Ferrero et al	2020	2	Correction with no text	105		1.60	c	0.52	0.01	0.10	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	2	2	2
37	Vraga et al	2020	1	Logic-based correction	385		1.22	c	1.35	0.00	0.07	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
37	Vraga et al	2020	1	Fact-based correction	375		0.41	c	1.10	0.00	0.07	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
38	Vraga, Kim, and Cook	2019	1	Logic correction for climate	90		1.72	c	-1.70	0.03	0.16	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detected correction	In-person correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
38	Vraga, Kim, and Cook	2019	1	change misinformation Humor correction for climate change misinformation	90	0.39		c	-1.64	0.03	0.16	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
38	Vraga, Kim, and Cook	2019	1	Logic correction for hpv vaccine misinformation Humor	90	5.75		c	10.07	0.57	0.75	2	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
38	Vraga, Kim, and Cook	2019	1	correction for hpv vaccine misinformation Correction with an additional (shorter) infographic about reasoning of scientific consensus; misinformation about climate change	90	4.79		c	4.67	0.13	0.36	2	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
38	van Stekelenburg et al	2021	1	infographic about reasoning of scientific consensus; misinformation about climate change Correction with an additional infographic about reasoning of scientific consensus; misinformation about climate change	76	0.50		c	-1.04	0.02	0.14	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
38	van Stekelenburg et al	2021	1	infographic about reasoning of scientific consensus; misinformation about climate change Correction without an additional infographic; misinformation about climate change	72	0.06		c	-1.16	0.02	0.15	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
38	van Stekelenburg et al	2021	1	infographic; misinformation about climate change Correction with an additional (shorter) infographic about reasoning of scientific consensus;	74	1.98		c	1.27	0.03	0.16	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
39	van Stekelenburg et al	2021	2	infographic about reasoning of scientific consensus;	149	1.30		c	0.35	0.01	0.08	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detail of correction	Impersonal correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
39	van Stekelenburg et al	2021	2	misinformation about genetically engineered food Correction with an additional infographic about reasoning of scientific consensus; misinformation about genetically engineered food Correction without an additional infographic;	147		0.70	c	0.16	0.01	0.08	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
39	van Stekelenburg et al	2021	2	misinformation about genetically engineered food Correction with an additional infographic; misinformation about genetically engineered food Correction with an additional infographic about reasoning of scientific consensus;	146		2.68	c	0.38	0.01	0.09	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
40	van Stekelenburg et al	2021	3	misinformation about genetically engineered food Correction without an additional infographic; misinformation about genetically engineered food Correction without an additional infographic;	275		1.78	c	0.04	0.00	0.06	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
40	van Stekelenburg et al	2021	3	misinformation about genetically engineered food Correction without an additional infographic; misinformation about genetically engineered food Correction without an additional infographic;	287		0.81	c	0.36	0.00	0.06	1	3	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
41	Bode, Vraga, and Trully	2021	1	Pew correction	603		1.48	c	0.02	0.00	0.04	2	2	-1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
41	Bode, Vraga, and Trully	2021	1	Pew likes correction	603		-0.11	c	0.02	0.00	0.04	2	2	-1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
42	Andrews	2021	1	Simple correction	115	-0.03	-0.03	c	0.56	0.01	0.10	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
42	Andrews	2021	1	Causal appeal correction	114	-0.03	-0.03	c	0.13	0.01	0.09	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1

Study	Authors	Year	Exp erim ent Num ber	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i> (impu ted)	Typ e of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Nega tive misi nfor mati on	Dom ain of misi nfor mati on	Fictiti ous issue	Det aile d corr ecti on	In- pers on corr ectio n	Attitu dinal conge niality	Lik ely fa mil iari ty	Iss ue pol ari zati on	Stud y sam ple	La b con tex t	Met hod of ES calc ulat ion
42	Andrews	2021	1	Emotional appeal correction	116	-0.03	-0.03	c	-0.17	0.01	0.09	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
42	Andrews	2021	1	Robust correction	113	-0.03	-0.03	c	0.14	0.01	0.09	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
42	Andrews	2021	1	Simple correction	115	-0.03	-0.03	mp	0.44	0.01	0.10	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
42	Andrews	2021	1	Causal appeal correction	114	-0.03	-0.03	mp	0.13	0.01	0.09	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
42	Andrews	2021	1	Emotional appeal correction	116	-0.03	-0.03	mp	-0.15	0.01	0.09	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
42	Andrews	2021	1	Robust correction	113	-0.03	-0.03	mp	0.12	0.01	0.09	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
43	Smith and Seitz	2019	1	Correction with 2 articles	147		0.96	c	0.10	0.01	0.08	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	2	2
44	McDiarmid et al	2021	1	With the introduction of the replication study method	586		1.93	c	0.88	0.00	0.05	1	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	1	-1		2	2
44	McDiarmid et al	2021	1	Without the introduction of the replication study method	539		2.63	c	0.81	0.00	0.05	1	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	1	-1		2	2
45	Winters et al	2021	1	Plausible alternative correction	454		2.16	c	0.64	0.00	0.05	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	2	1	1
46	Kuru et al	2021	1	Hesitancy-inducing misinformation with science-supporting statistical correction	1180	-0.02	-0.02	c	0.13	0.00	0.03	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
46	Kuru et al	2021	1	Hesitancy-inducing misinformation with science-consistent correction	1173	-0.02	-0.02	c	0.08	0.00	0.03	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
46	Kuru et al	2021	1	Hesitancy-inducing misinformation with science-supporting statistical correction	1180	-0.02	-0.02	mp	0.14	0.00	0.03	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	N	Misinformation d	Misinformation d (imputed)	Type of d	d	V	SE	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detected correction	In-person correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
46	Kuru et al	2021	1	Hesitancy-inducing misinformation with science-consistent correction	1173	-0.02	-0.02	mp	0.09	0.00	0.03	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
47	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	1	Correct misinformation about Fauci's view on vaccine	7		2.44	c	2.50	0.53	0.73	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
47	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	1	Correct misinformation about GMO	19		1.14	c	0.45	0.06	0.24	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
47	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	1	Correct misinformation about new treatment for COVID-19	8		1.14	c	-0.18	0.13	0.36	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
47	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	1	Bypass misinformation about Fauci's view on vaccine	9		2.58	c	-0.81	0.14	0.38	1	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
47	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	1	Bypass misinformation about GMO	15		2.16	c	-0.13	0.07	0.26	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
47	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	1	Bypass misinformation about new treatment for COVID-19	12		0.51	c	-0.84	0.11	0.33	1	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
48	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	2	Correction	63		1.37	c	0.72	0.02	0.14	1	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
48	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	2	Bypassing	59		0.14	c	-0.17	0.02	0.13	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
49	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	3	Correction	60		1.91	c	0.07	0.02	0.13	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
49	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	3	Bypassing	61		0.73	c	0.29	0.02	0.13	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
50	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	4	Correction	61		0.39	c	0.15	0.02	0.13	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1

Study	Authors	Year	Exp erim ent Num ber	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i> (impu ted)	Typ e of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Nega tive misi nfor mati on	Dom ain of misi nfor mati on	Fictiti ous issue	Det aile d corr ecti on	In- pers on corr ectio n	Attitu dinal conge niality	Lik ely fa mil iari ty	Iss ue pol ari zati on	Stud y sam ple	La b con tex t	Met hod of ES calc ulat ion
50	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	4	Bypassing	60		2.24	c	0.20	0.02	0.13	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
51	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	5	Correction	240		0.05	c	0.63	0.00	0.07	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
51	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	5	Bypassing	240		1.81	c	0.08	0.00	0.06	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
52	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	6	Correction	204		2.36	c	0.87	0.01	0.08	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
52	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	6	Bypassing	202		2.12	c	0.37	0.01	0.07	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
53	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	7	Correction	101		1.60	c	1.15	0.02	0.13	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
53	Calabrese and Albarracin	2021	7	Bypassing	101		0.28	c	0.31	0.01	0.10	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
54	Ecker	2022	1	Visual correction	152		0.61	c	0.19	0.01	0.08	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
54	Ecker	2022	1	Fear appeal correction	161		1.26	c	0.21	0.01	0.08	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
55	Jacobson	2022	1	Polar theme with aligned external representation	64		1.20	c	0.05	0.02	0.13	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
55	Jacobson	2022	1	Polar theme with misaligned external representation	60		1.02	c	0.07	0.02	0.13	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
55	Jacobson	2022	1	Weather theme with aligned external representation	72		1.97	c	0.15	0.01	0.12	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
55	Jacobson	2022	1	Weather theme with misaligned external representation	61		1.59	c	0.15	0.02	0.13	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
56	Gawronski, Brannon, & Ng	2022	1	Alternative correction	366		1.01	mp	0.05	0.00	0.05	2	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
56	Gawronski, Brannon, & Ng	2022	1	Negation	366		-0.01	mp	0.18	0.00	0.05	2	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detail of correction	In-person correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
57	Gawronski, Brannon, & Ng	2022	2	Affirmation correction	586		0.27	mp	0.13	0.00	0.04	2	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
57	Gawronski, Brannon, & Ng	2022	2	Negation	586		0.52	mp	0.15	0.00	0.04	2	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
58	Yousuf, van der Linden	2021	1	Debunking condition	505		0.38	c	0.23	0.00	0.05	1	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
59	van der Linden	2021	2	Consensus condition	120		1.46	c	0.46	0.01	0.10	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
60	van der Linden	2017	1	Consensus treatment	698		2.10	c	1.23	0.00	0.05	1	3	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	1
61	Pluviano, Watt, & Salla	2017	1	visual correction	30		0.43	c	-0.27	0.04	0.19	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	1	2
61	Pluviano, Watt, & Salla	2017	1	fear correction	30		0.43	c	-0.91	0.05	0.22	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	1	2
61	Pluviano, Watt, & Salla	2017	1	visual correction	60		0.92	mp	-0.16	0.02	0.13	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	1	1
61	Pluviano, Watt, & Salla	2017	1	fear correction	60		1.96	mp	-1.17	0.03	0.17	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	1	1
62	Vraga and Bode	2018	1	Correction with source	28		-1.03	mp	4.11	0.33	0.57	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1
62	Vraga and Bode	2018	1	Correction without source	28		0.07	mp	1.78	0.09	0.30	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1
63	Carey et al	2022	1	US sample - waves 1 and 2	577		2.17	c	0.04	0.00	0.04	2	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
63	Carey et al	2022	1	US sample - waves 1 and 3	577		0.35	c	0.01	0.00	0.04	2	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
63	Carey et al	2022	1	UK sample - waves 1 and 2	790		1.05	c	0.04	0.00	0.04	2	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
63	Carey et al	2022	1	UK sample - waves 1 and 3	790		1.75	c	0.08	0.00	0.04	2	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
64	Lanius et al	2021	1	Over reported participants with over reported misinformation	70		3.35	c	0.50	0.02	0.13	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
64	Lanius et al	2021	1	Under reported participants with under reported misinformation	138		2.52	c	0.86	0.01	0.10	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2

Study	Authors	Year	Exp rim ent Num ber	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i> (impu ted)	Typ e of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Nega tive misi nfor mati on	Dom ain of misi nfor mati on	Fictiti ous issue	Det aile d corr ecti on	In- pers on corr ectio n	Attitu dinal conge niality	Lik ely fa mil iari ty	Iss ue pol ari zati on	Stud y sam ple	La b con tex t	Met hod of ES calc ulat ion
64	Lanius et al	2021	1	Other participants with over reported misinformation	48		2.08	c	0.32	0.02	0.15	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
64	Lanius et al	2021	1	Other participants with under reported misinformation	41		0.82	c	0.92	0.04	0.19	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	2	2
65	Vijaykumar et al	2021	1	UK sample with full falsity misinformation	242		0.20	c	-0.05	0.00	0.06	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
65	Vijaykumar et al	2021	1	UK sample with partial falsity misinformation	242		1.65	c	-0.10	0.00	0.06	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
65	Vijaykumar et al	2021	1	Brazil sample with full falsity misinformation	243		0.85	c	-0.16	0.00	0.06	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
65	Vijaykumar et al	2021	1	Brazil sample with partial falsity misinformation	243		0.54	c	0.04	0.00	0.06	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
66	Pluviano et al	2022	1	MMR vaccine misinformation (control: presented autism and vaccination but no reference to rumors about the correlation of vaccination with the clinical conditions)	130		3.11	mp	-4.25	0.08	0.28	2	2	-1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	1	1
67	Pluviano et al	2022	2	Zika virus vaccine misinformation (control: presented epilepsy and vaccination but no reference to rumors about the correlation of vaccination with the clinical conditions)	130		2.08	mp	-1.71	0.02	0.14	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	1	1

Study	Authors	Year	Experiment Number	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i>	Misinformation <i>d</i> (imputed)	Type of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Negative misinformation	Domain of misinformation	Fictitious issue	Detected correction	In-person correction	Attitudinal congeniality	Likely familiarity	Issue polarization	Study sample	Lab context	Method of ES calculation
67	Pluviano et al	2022	2	MMR vaccine misinformation (control: presented autism and vaccination but no reference to rumors about the correlation of vaccination with the clinical conditions) Zika virus vaccine misinformation (control: presented epilepsy and vaccination but no reference to rumors about the correlation of vaccination with the clinical conditions)	130		3.28	mp	-1.93	0.02	0.15	2	2	-1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	1	1
67	Pluviano et al	2022	2	MMR vaccine misinformation (control: presented epilepsy and vaccination but no reference to rumors about the correlation of vaccination with the clinical conditions)	130		1.27	mp	-1.41	0.02	0.12	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	2	1	1
68	Challenger, Sumner, & Bott	2022	1	Question-answer correction	440		0.28	c	0.39	0.00	0.05	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
68	Challenger, Sumner, & Bott	2022	1	Fact-only correction	435		3.29	c	0.33	0.00	0.05	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
68	Challenger, Sumner, & Bott	2022	1	Fact and myth correction	416		1.42	c	0.38	0.00	0.05	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
69	Challenger, Sumner, & Bott	2022	2	Question-answer correction	691		2.99	c	0.34	0.00	0.04	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
69	Challenger, Sumner, & Bott	2022	2	Fact-only correction	687		1.84	c	0.28	0.00	0.04	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
69	Challenger, Sumner, & Bott	2022	2	Fact and myth correction	704		1.57	c	0.33	0.00	0.04	2	2	1	2	-1	-1	1	1	2	2	2
70	Swire-Thompson et al	2022	1	pre-test control vs. post-test correction	388		4.05	c	2.35	0.01	0.10	2	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1

Study	Authors	Year	Exp rim ent Num ber	Row description	<i>N</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i>	Misin forma tion <i>d</i> (impu ted)	Typ e of <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>SE</i>	Nega tive misi nfor mati on	Dom ain of misi nfor mati on	Fictiti ous issue	Det aile d corr ecti on	In- pers on corr ectio n	Attitu dinal conge niality	Lik ely fa mil iari ty	Iss ue pol ari zati on	Stud y sam ple	La b con tex t	Met hod of ES calc ulat ion
71	Swire- Thompson et al	2022	2	pre-test control vs. post-test correction	532		2.90	c	2.48	0.01	0.09	2	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1
72	Villanti et al	2019	1	A brief nicotine message correction	521		1.47	c	0.39	0.00	0.05	1	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1
73	Svenson, Green, and Maynard	2021	1	A correction video featuring leading e- cigarette experts	261		0.19	c	0.96	0.01	0.07	1	2	-1	2	1	-1	1	-1	2	2	1
73	Svenson, Green, and Maynard	2021	1	A Cancer Research UK (CRUK) text- only correction video	253		0.42	c	0.48	0.00	0.07	1	2	-1	2	-1	-1	1	-1	2	2	1
74	Shi et al	2020	2	e-cigarette correction	403		1.57	c	0.22	0.00	0.05	1	2	1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	1

Note. *N* indicates sample sizes, *d* indicates the Cohen’s *ds*, *V* indicates variances, *SE* indicates standard errors, c = the correct effects, and mp = reverse of the misinformation-persistence effects, negative misinformation (1 = neutral; 2 = negative), domains of misinformation (1 = politics; 2 = health; 3 = environment; -1 = others), fictitious issue (1 = fictitious; -1 = real), detailed correction (2 = detailed; 1 = succinct), in-person correction (1 = yes; -1 = no), attitudinal congeniality of the correction (1 = yes; -1 = no), likely familiarity with the topic (1 = yes; -1 = no), issue polarization (1 = yes; -1 = no), study sample (1 = U.S.; 2 = other countries), lab context (1 = lab; 2 = online), and method of the effect-size calculation (1 = between; 2 = within).

Supplementary Table 2*Examples of Excluded Reports Measuring Non-Science-Relevant Misinformation.*

Year	Authors	Title	Journal	DOI	Found at	Note
2022	Ecker et al.	Combining Refutations and Social Norms Increases Belief Change	-	-	Top scholar	Misinformation related to refugees coming at a long-term cost, a move towards renewable energy and its effect on the Australian job market, the introduction of medicinal cannabis and its effect on the Australian healthcare system; and the provision of government-funded shelter to reduce homelessness (a filler claim).
2022	Lee & Shin	Something that They Never Said: Multimodal Disinformation and Source Vividness in Understanding the Power of AI-Enabled Deepfake News.	Media Psychology	https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2021.2007489	Comm Source	Misinformation was about drug use legalization and pro-choice opinion on abortion.
2023	McIlhiney et al.	Sensitivity to misinformation retractions in the continued influence paradigm: Evidence for stability	Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology	https://doi.org/10.1177/17470218211048986	Google scholar	Misinformation was about wildfire, drug dealer, train derail, water contamination, warehouse explosion, burglary, car accident, online security breach.
2020	Reynolds	Why does misinformation persist? Cognitive explanations of the implicit message effect	ProQuest	-	PsycInfo	Misinformation was about a crime report.
2020	Clayton et al.	Real solutions for fake news? Measuring the effectiveness of general warnings and fact-check tags in reducing belief in false stories on social media.	Political Behavior	https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-019-09533-0	PsycInfo	Misinformation was about political news headlines (Trump revamped the military draft and inaugural speech).

Supplementary Table 3*Examples of Excluded Reports after Evaluating Full Text Articles*

Full text downl oaded	Final decision	Exclusi on reason	Year	Authors	Title	Journal	DOI	Found at	Note
yes	exclude	1	2020	Pennycook et al.	Fighting COVID-19 misinformation on social media: Experimental evidence for a scalable accuracy-nudge intervention	Psychological Science	https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620939054	Google scholar	No measures of beliefs or attitudes, outcome was sharing false claims about COVID-19
yes	exclude	3	2020	Braun	Correcting Explanatory Misinformation	-	https://osf.io/mfa3h/	OSF	The report was about false suggestion and eyewitnesses to misremember witnessing events they did not see and do so with high confidence
yes	exclude	5	2021	Winters	Contagious (Mis)Communication: The Role of Risk Communication and Misinformation in Infectious Disease Outbreaks	-	-	ProQuest Dissertation Publishing	A duplicate of another article, http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-006954
yes	exclude	2	2022	Lee, Kim, & Lee	Unlocking Conspiracy Belief Systems: How Fact-Checking Label on Twitter Counters Conspiratorial MMR Vaccine Misinformation	Health Communication	https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2022.2031452	Google scholar	Reported only regression results with covariates
yes	exclude	4	2022	van Lange & Rand	Human Cooperation and the Crises of Climate Change, COVID-19, and Misinformation	-	https://psyarxiv.com/6tpa8/	Google scholar	A review paper

Note. Exclusion reason #1 is about articles having no measure of beliefs or attitudes; exclusion reason #2 is about articles having no appropriate comparison group or statistics; exclusion reason #3 is about articles presenting (ambiguous) misinformation and/ or correction; exclusion reason #4 is about articles to be review/ theoretical papers; exclusion reason #5 is about articles duplicates with another work.

Supplementary Table 4

Results of Linear Regression of the Misinformation Effects with Correction and Misinformation-Persistence Effects


Variable	Imputed data using <i>Amelia</i>	Imputed data using <i>mice</i>	Original data (with missing data)
Intercept	-0.12	0.05	-0.16
Correction	1.1	0.97	1.13
Misinformation persistence	0.9	0.77	0.95

Supplementary Table 5***Meta-Regression Results of the Debunking Effects***

Variable	Without imputation			With imputation		
	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i>	95% CI	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Intercept	-0.05 (0.55)	.925	-1.35, 1.25	-1.37 (0.6)	.027	-2.57, -0.16
Nature of the misinformation						
Negative misinformation^	0.47 (0.53)	.412	-0.8, 1.73	0.96 (0.35)	.008	0.26, 1.65
Nature of the correction						
Detailed correction^	-0.15 (0.25)	.568	-0.73, 0.44	0.71 (0.28)	.015	0.15, 1.28
Recipients of the misinformation						
Attitudinal congeniality of the correction^	-	-	-	1.57 (0.99)	.116	-0.40, 3.54
Polarizing issue^	-0.6 (0.53)	.295	-1.85, 0.66	-1.01 (0.39)	.012	-1.78, -0.23
<i>Control factor:</i>						
Domain of misinformation: political^	-	-	-	0.57 (0.76)	.459	-0.96, 2.09
Domain of misinformation: health^	-	-	-	-1.32 (0.5)	.010	-2.32, -0.33
Domain of misinformation: environment^	-	-	-	0.02 (0.61)	.973	-1.20, 1.24
Fictitious issue^	-0.14 (0.65)	.834	-1.69, 1.40	0.85 (0.34)	.016	0.17, 1.53
Likely familiarity with the topic ^	0.55 (0.74)	.480	-1.20, 2.30	1.19 (0.38)	.003	0.43, 1.95
In-person correction^	1.14 (0.45)	.037	0.09, 2.20	0.73 (0.45)	.109	-0.17, 1.64
Report and methodological characteristics						
Study sample^	1.82 (0.65)	.027	0.28, 3.35	-0.09 (0.26)	.743	-0.6, 0.43
Lab context^	-	-	-	0.93 (0.38)	.019	0.16, 1.69
Method of effect-size calculation^	-	-	-	-0.27 (0.22)	.221	-0.72, 0.17
Misinformation effects	-0.13 (0.37)	.728	-1, 0.73	0.05 (0.25)	.835	-0.45, 0.55

Note. A caret indicates a categorical variable. Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors in parentheses. *p* = *p* values; 95% CI = 95% confidence intervals. Robust variance estimation (RVE) was used for the debunking effects.

Supplementary Figure 1



References

References with an asterisk were not included in the meta-analysis. Each article contributes to at least one report.

1. *Honaker, J., King, G. & Blackwell, M. Amelia II: A program for missing data. *J Stat Softw* **45**, 1–47 (2011).
2. *van Buuren, S. & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. mice: Multivariate imputation by chained equations in R. *J Stat Softw* **45**, 1–67 (2011).
3. Anderson, C. A., Lepper, M. R. & Ross, L. Perseverance of social theories: The role of explanation in the persistence of discredited information. *J Pers Soc Psychol* **39**, 1037–1049 (1980).
4. Anderson, C. A. Inoculation and counterexplanation: Debiasing techniques in the perseverance of social theories. *Soc Cogn* **1**, 126–139 (1982).
5. Anderson, C. A. Abstract and concrete data in the perseverance of social theories: When weak data lead to unshakeable beliefs. *J Exp Soc Psychol* **19**, 93–108 (1983).
6. Anderson, C. A., New, B. L. & Speer, J. R. Argument availability as a mediator of social theory perseverance. *Soc Cogn* **3**, 235–249 (1985).
7. Davies, M. F. Belief persistence after evidential discrediting: The impact of generated versus provided explanations on the likelihood of discredited outcomes. *J Exp Soc Psychol* **33**, 561–578 (1997).
8. Golding, J. M., Fowler, S. B., Long, D. L. & Latta, H. Instructions to disregard potentially useful information: The effects of pragmatics on evaluative judgments and recall. *J Mem Lang* **29**, 212–227 (1990).
9. Green, M. C. & Donahue, J. K. Persistence of belief change in the face of deception: The effect of factual stories revealed to be false. *Media Psychol* **14**, 312–331 (2011).

10. Greitemeyer, T. Article retracted, but the message lives on. *Psychon Bull Rev* **21**, 557–561 (2014).
11. Guenther, C. L. & Alicke, M. D. Self-enhancement and belief perseverance. *J Exp Soc Psychol* **44**, 706–712 (2008).
12. Misra, S. Is conventional debriefing adequate? An ethical issue in consumer research. *J Acad Mark Sci* **20**, 269–273 (1992).
13. Nestler, S. Belief perseverance: The role of accessible content and accessibility experiences. *Soc Psychol* **41**, 35–41 (2010).
14. Sherman, D. K. & Kim, H. S. Affective perseverance: The resistance of affect to cognitive invalidation. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* **28**, 224–237 (2002).
15. Wright, E. F., Christie, S. D., Johnson, R. W. & Stoffer, E. S. The impact of group discussion on the theory-perseverance bias. *J Soc Psychol* **136**, 85–98 (1996).
16. Wyer, R. S. & Budesheim, T. L. Person memory and judgments: The impact of information that one is told to disregard. *J Pers Soc Psychol* **53**, 14–29 (1987).
17. Wyer, R. S. & Unverzagt, W. H. Effects of instructions to disregard information on its subsequent recall and use in making judgments. *J Pers Soc Psychol* **48**, 533–549 (1985).
18. Ecker, U. K. H. & Ang, L. C. Political attitudes and the processing of misinformation corrections. *Polit Psychol* **40**, 241–260 (2019).
19. De keersmaecker, J. & Roets, A. ‘Fake news’: Incorrect, but hard to correct. The role of cognitive ability on the impact of false information on social impressions. *Intelligence* **65**, 107–110 (2017).
20. Ecker, U. K. H. & Rodricks, A. E. Do false allegations persist? Retracted misinformation does not continue to influence explicit person impressions. *J Appl Res Mem Cogn* **9**, 587–601 (2020).

21. Sangalang, A., Ophir, Y. & Cappella, J. N. The potential for narrative correctives to combat misinformation. *Journal of Communication* **69**, 298–319 (2019).
22. Ecker, U. K. H., Sze, B. K. N. & Andreotta, M. Corrections of political misinformation: no evidence for an effect of partisan worldview in a US convenience sample. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* **376**, (2021).
23. Ferrero, M., Hardwicke, T. E., Konstantinidis, E. & Vadillo, M. A. The effectiveness of refutation texts to correct misconceptions among educators. *J Exp Psychol Appl* **26**, 411–421 (2020).
24. Vraga, E. K., Kim, S. C., Cook, J. & Bode, L. Testing the effectiveness of correction placement and type on Instagram. *International Journal of Press/Politics* **25**, 632–652 (2020).
25. van Stekelenburg, A., Schaap, G., Veling, H. & Buijzen, M. Boosting understanding and identification of scientific consensus can help to correct false beliefs. *Psychol Sci* **32**, 1549–1565 (2021).
26. Bode, L., Vraga, E. K. & Tully, M. Correcting misperceptions about genetically modified food on social media: Examining the impact of experts, social media heuristics, and the gateway belief model. *Sci Commun* **43**, 225–251 (2021).
27. Andrews, E. A. Combating COVID-19 vaccine conspiracy theories: Debunking misinformation about vaccines, Bill Gates, 5G, and microchips using enhanced correctives. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* (State University of New York at Buffalo, 2021).
28. Smith, C. N. & Seitz, H. H. Correcting misinformation about neuroscience via social media. *Sci Commun* **41**, 790–819 (2019).
29. McDiarmid, A. D. *et al.* Psychologists update their beliefs about effect sizes after replication studies. *Nature Human Behavior* (2021) doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01220-7.

30. Winters, M. *et al.* Debunking highly prevalent health misinformation using audio dramas delivered by WhatsApp: evidence from a randomised controlled trial in Sierra Leone. *BMJ Glob Health* **6**, 6954 (2021).
31. Kuru, O. *et al.* The effects of scientific messages and narratives about vaccination. *PLoS One* **16**, e0248328 (2021).
32. Calabrese, C. & Albarracin, D. Unpublished data.
33. Ecker, U. Correcting vaccine misinformation: A failure to replicate familiarity or fear-driven backfire effects. *OSF* <https://osf.io/dwyma/> (2022).
34. Jacobson, N. G. What does climate change look like to you? The role of internal and external representations in facilitating conceptual change about the weather and climate distinction. (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, 2022).
35. Gawronski, B., Brannon, S. M. & Ng, N. L. Debunking misinformation about a causal link between vaccines and autism: Two preregistered tests of dual-process versus single-process predictions. (With conflicting results). Under review. (2022).
36. Yousuf, H. *et al.* A media intervention applying debunking versus non-debunking content to combat vaccine misinformation in elderly in the Netherlands: A digital randomised trial. *EClinicalMedicine* **35**, (2021).
37. Maertens, R., Anseel, F. & van der Linden, S. Combatting climate change misinformation: Evidence for longevity of inoculation and consensus messaging effects. *J Environ Psychol* **70**, 101455 (2020).
38. van der Linden, S., Leiserowitz, A., Rosenthal, S. & Maibach, E. Inoculating the public against misinformation about climate change. *Global Challenges* **1**, 1600008 (2017).
39. Pluviano, S., Watt, C. & Sala, S. della. Misinformation lingers in memory: Failure of three pro-vaccination strategies. *PLoS One* **12**, 15 (2017).

40. Vraga, E. K. & Bode, L. I do not believe you: how providing a source corrects health misperceptions across social media platforms. *Inf Commun Soc* **21**, 1337–1353 (2018).
41. Carey, J. M. *et al.* The ephemeral effects of fact-checks on COVID-19 misperceptions in the United States, Great Britain and Canada. *Nature Human Behaviour* **2022** 6:2 **6**, 236–243 (2022).
42. Lanius, C., Weber, R. & MacKenzie, W. I. Use of bot and content flags to limit the spread of misinformation among social networks: a behavior and attitude survey. *Soc Netw Anal Min* **11**, 1–15 (2021).
43. Vijaykumar, S. *et al.* How shades of truth and age affect responses to COVID-19 (Mis)information: randomized survey experiment among WhatsApp users in UK and Brazil. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* **2021** 8:1 **8**, 1–12 (2021).
44. Pluviano, S., Watt, C., Pompéia, S., Ekuni, R. & della Sala, S. Forming and updating vaccination beliefs: does the continued effect of misinformation depend on what we think we know? *Cogn Process* **23**, 367–378 (2022).
45. Challenger, A., Sumner, P. & Bott, L. COVID-19 myth-busting: an experimental study. *BMC Public Health* **22**, 1–13 (2022).
46. Swire-Thompson, B., Miklaucic, N., Wihbey, J. P., Lazer, D. & DeGutis, J. The Backfire Effect After Correcting Misinformation Is Strongly Associated With Reliability. *J Exp Psychol Gen* **151**, 1655–1665 (2022).
47. Villanti, A. C. *et al.* Impact of Brief Nicotine Messaging on Nicotine-Related Beliefs in a U.S. Sample. *Am J Prev Med* **57**, e135–e142 (2019).
48. Svenson, M., Green, J. & Maynard, O. M. Tackling Smoker Misperceptions About E-cigarettes Using Expert Videos. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research* **23**, 1848–1854 (2021).

49. Shi, R., Feldman, R., Liu, J. & Clark, P. I. The Dilemma of Correcting Nicotine Misperceptions: Nicotine Replacement Therapy versus Electronic Cigarettes. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2020.1800288> **36**, 1856–1866 (2020).
50. Vraga, E. K., Kim, S. C. & Cook, J. Testing logic-based and humor-based corrections for science, health, and political misinformation on social media. *J Broadcast Electron Media* **63**, 393–414 (2019).