**Supplementary material**

Because women report higher levels of infatuation and attachment than men (Langeslag, Muris, & Franken, 2013), because same-sex love may be more intense than opposite-sex love (Fisher, 2004), and because infatuation decreases and attachment increases with time since the start of the infatuation, with becoming involved in a romantic relationship with the beloved, and with the duration of the relationship (Langeslag et al., 2013), we considered the following control variables: gender of the participants (dummy coded), opposite- or same-sex beloved (dummy coded), how long participants had known their beloved, how long participants had had romantic feelings for their beloved, and whether participants were in a relationship with their beloved (dummy coded). To test if any of these control variables needed to be included in the analysis, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed between the control variables on the one hand, and the love variables (i.e., IAS infatuation and attachment scores) and cognitive control variables (i.e.., interference effect in RT, conflict adaptation effect in RT, and post-error slowing) on the other hand.

None of the control variables correlated significantly with infatuation level, -.211<all *r*s(81)<.082, all *p*s>.082. How long participants had had romantic feelings for their beloved correlated positively with attachment level, *r*(81)=.580, *p*<.001. Whether participants were in a relationship with their beloved correlated positively with attachment level as well, *r*(81)=.497, *p*<.001, indicating participants who were in a relationship had higher attachment levels than participants who were not in a relationship. None of the other control variables correlated significantly with attachment level, -.052<all *r*s(81)<.191, all *p*s>.084. Participant gender correlated with post-error slowing, *r*(81)=-.331, *p*=.002, indicating that women showed more post-error slowing than men. None of the other correlations between the control variables and the cognitive control variables were significant, -.185<all *r*s(81)<.143, all *p*s>.095. Because none of the control variable correlated with both a love variable and a cognitive control variable, they were not included in the main analyses.
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