

Citation [Database name]	<i>N</i> (Words)	Type of words	<i>N</i> (Subjects)	<i>N</i> (ratings per word)	Participants' age: <i>M</i> (Age range or <i>SD</i> )	Variables	Measurement scales	Comments / Observations	Data availability
Cameirão & Vicente (2010) <sup>a</sup>	1749	1008 nouns, 373 verbs, 332 adjectives, 36 adverbs	685 undergraduate students (Males=21%)	<i>M</i> =48 (range: 40-50)	20.5 (2.4)	– Age of acquisition (Data extracted from other studies regarding the following variables are also included: Familiarity, Imageability, Concreteness, Frequency, Grammatical class, Length Orthographic neighbors, Phonological neighbors)	9-point scale “The points of the scale correspond to the ages (in years): 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7-8; 9-10; 11-12; +13” (p. 475)	– 106 words in common with Marques et al. (2007); <i>r</i> =.944	doi: 10.3758/BRM.42.2.47
Félix et al. (2019) [Study 1]	170	137 nouns, 31 adjectives, 2 verbs	40 undergraduate students (Males=40%)	<i>M</i> =20 (range: 18-20)	21.5 (2.7)	– Familiarity – Concreteness	7-point scale 1= <i>unfamiliar</i> / <i>very abstract</i> ; 7= <i>very familiar</i> / <i>very concrete</i>	–	Data available by request to to the corresponding author: [sara.felix@ua.pt]
Félix et al. (2020)	224	Concrete nouns	248 adults and young adults (Males=21%)	<i>M</i> =125 (range: 97-148)	33.3 (14.1)	– Animacy	7-point scale 1= <i>totally nonliving, inanimate</i> ; 7= <i>totally living, animate</i>	– Words retrieved from Cameirão and Vicente (2010); Marques et al. (2007), and Soares et al. (2012, 2017)	Available at <a href="http://evo.psych.purdue.edu/data/">http:// evo.psych.purdue.edu/data/</a> and in the appendix of the article
Garcia-Marques (2003)	429	213 concrete nouns, 216 abstract nouns and adjectives	256 under- graduate students	32 ratings (per word, for each variable)	*	– Emotional valence – Familiarity (Data extracted from other studies regarding Concreteness – concrete and abstract words – are also included)	7-point scales 1= <i>negative</i> / <i>slightly familiar</i> ; 7= <i>positive</i> / <i>very familiar</i>	– Words are divided into two categories: concrete and abstract words; However, there was no data collection on the concreteness dimension	Table 1 of the article
Garrido & Prada (2018)	640	380 nouns and 260 adjectives (320 EP and 320 English words)	230 students (Males=19%)	(range: 26-32)	23.5 (6.9)	– Emotional valence – Emotional intensity – Familiarity	7-point scales 1= <i>very negative</i> / <i>not very intense</i> / <i>not very familiar</i> ; 7= <i>very positive</i> / <i>very intense</i> / <i>very familiar</i>	– Participants were bilinguals: EP native speakers, also fluent in English (self-reported)	Authors' OSF Project ( <a href="https://osf.io/jzy42/">https://osf.io/jzy42/</a> )
Garrido et al. (2011)	336	282 nouns, 28 adjectives, 16 verbs, and 10 words that can be both nouns and adjectives	230 students (Males=20%)	<30 ratings (per word, for each variable)	24.8 (7.5; range: 17-63)	– Emotional valence – Spatial content	7-point scales 1= <i>negative</i> / <i>down</i> ; 7= <i>positive</i> / <i>up</i>	–	Tables 1 to 4 of the article

Citation [Database name]	<i>N</i> (Words)	Type of words	<i>N</i> (Subjects)	<i>N</i> (ratings per word)	Participants' age: <i>M</i> (Age range or <i>SD</i> )	Variables	Measurement scales	Comments / Observations	Data availability
Garrido et al. (2010)	123	117 nouns, 2 adjectives, and 4 words that can be both nouns and adjectives	54 students (Males=22%)	$M_{\text{Political}}=51.8$ (range: 49-53); $M_{\text{Valence}}=42.4$ (range: 39-44)	24.2 (6.7)	– Emotional valence – Political connotation (left-wing / right-wing)	7-point scales 1= <i>negative / left wing</i> ; 7= <i>positive / right wing</i>	– Words related with politics	Tables 1 to 3 of the article
Gaspar (2009)	270	277 nouns, 38 adjectives, and 5 words that can be both nouns and adjectives	183 under- graduate students (Males=13%)	$M_{\text{Valence}}=84.5$ (range: 80-89 ratings); $M_{\text{Familiarity}}=82.0$ (range: 79-85)	19.7 (1.9)	– Emotional valence – Familiarity	7-point scales 1= <i>very unpleasant / not familiar</i> ; 7= <i>very pleasant / very familiar</i>	– Words extracted from PORLEX (Gomes, 2001; Gomes & Castro, 2003)	Tables 1 to 2 of the article
erónimo (2003)	284	Adjectives (almost all)	140 students	N/A (the article each word was r ated by 70 participants)	*	– Subjective frequency of written words – Synonymy	7-point scales 1= <i>never encountered this word in my life / these two words have completely different meanings</i> ; 7= <i>encountered this word several times a day / these two words have exactly the same meaning</i>	– Words related to four personality traits – 111 words extracted from Garrido's (2001) and Jerónimo's (2001) Master thesis, as cited in Jerónimo (2003)	Appendix of the article
Leitão et al. (2010)	252	Nouns <i>Words from different categories</i> : Living (32 animals, 22 fruits, 28 vegetables); Non-living (24 instruments, 20 transports, 26 clothes, 16 other); 26 Human agents/Jobs; 33 Events; 25 States or Psychological attributes	214 students (Males=50%)	(range: 35-37)	24.4 (range: 18-42)	– Age of acquisition – Familiarity – Imageability (Data extracted from other studies regarding the following variables are also included: Frequency, Length (long/short word)	Familiarity and Imageability: 7-point scales 1= <i>never used the word / low imageability</i> ; 7= <i>very frequent use of the word / high imageability</i> Age of acquisition: Participants had an empty field to write at which age they learnt each word (then, their responses were converted to a 7-point scale, composed of age intervals)	– Frequency data extracted from CORLEX (Nascimento, 2003) – Correlation with Marques's (2004, 2005; Marques et al., 2007) data	Appendix of the article

Citation [Database name]	<i>N</i> (Words)	Type of words	<i>N</i> (Subjects)	<i>N</i> (ratings per word)	Participants' age: <i>M</i> (Age range or <i>SD</i> )	Variables	Measurement scales	Comments / Observations	Data availability
Marques (2004)	459	320 concrete nouns (rated by the 1 <sup>st</sup> sample) and 139 concrete and abstract nouns (plus 80 words already rated by the 1 <sup>st</sup> sample were rated by the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sample)	(2 samples were tested) 1 <sup>st</sup> sample: 79 undergraduate students (Males=23%); 2 <sup>nd</sup> sample: 34 undergraduate students (Males=21%)	N/A	1 <sup>st</sup> sample: <i>M</i> =18.3; 2 <sup>nd</sup> sample: <i>M</i> =18.6	– Familiarity (regarding the word's meaning and referent) (Note: Not all words were rated in both these measures)	5-point scale 1= <i>very familiar</i> ; 5= <i>not familiar</i>	– Inverse scale (higher scores reveal lower familiarity rates) – Familiarity ratings regarding the word's meaning and referent (Laroche & Saumier, 1993)	Appendix of the article
Marques (2005)	250	Nouns	103 under- graduate students (Males=19%)	N/A (the article implies that each word received imagery and concreteness ratings by 53 and 50 participants, respectively)	19.2	– Imagery – Concreteness	7-point scales 1= <i>high abstractness / low imageability</i> ; 7= <i>high concreteness / high imageability</i>	–	Appendix of the article
Marques et al. (2007)	834	Nouns	110 under- graduate students (Males=13%)	<i>M</i> =22 (range: 21-23)	18.5 (range: 17-26)	– Age of acquisition (Data extracted from other studies regarding the following variables are also included: Imageability, Familiarity, Frequency, Concreteness)	7-point scale (+1 point); The points of the AoA scale correspond to the ages (in years): 0-2; 3-4; 5-6; 7-8; 9-10; 11-12; +13; I don't know the word	– Words selected from Marques (1997, 2004) – Correlation with AoA obtained in foreign studies	doi: 10.3758/BF03193013
Pimentel & Albuquerque (2014)	12	Nouns (almost all)	90 students (Males=27%)	N/A (the article implies that all participants provided ratings of all variables for all words)	21.9 (4.7; range: 18-38)	– Concreteness – Emotional valence – Familiarity	7-point scales 1= <i>high abstractness / negative / low familiarity</i> ; 7= <i>high concreteness / positive / high familiarity</i>	– 12 critical items of semantically associated word lists (DRM paradigm)	Tables 1 to 3 of the article
Prada & Silva (2008)	400	Adjectives	173 students (Males=17%)	N/A	28.9 (3.9; range: 17-51)	– Emotional / Affective valence – Familiarity	7-point scales 1= <i>negative / not familiar</i> ; 7= <i>positive / very familiar</i>	–	Table 1 of the article

Citation [Database name]	<i>N</i> (Words)	Type of words	<i>N</i> (Subjects)	<i>N</i> (ratings per word)	Participants' age: <i>M</i> (Age range or <i>SD</i> )	Variables	Measurement scales	Comments / Observations	Data availability
Santi et al. (2015) [Study 1]	280	Nouns	110 students (Males=25%)	N/A	3 rating groups – Domain typicality ( <i>n</i> =24): <i>M</i> =19.4; – Familiarity ( <i>n</i> =29): <i>M</i> =18.7; – Super- ordinate typicality ( <i>n</i> =57): <i>M</i> =19.9	– Domain typicality – Familiarity – Superordinate typicality	7-point rating scales 1= <i>very good exemplar / item never perceived or produced</i> ; 7= <i>very bad exemplar / item perceived or produced very frequently</i>	The word “cavalo” [horse] appears twice, in different categories.	Appendix A of the article
Soares et al. (2012) [ANEW]	1034	Nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverb, interjection	958 under- graduate and graduate students (Males=65%)	N/A	22.82 (5.41)	– Arousal – Dominance – Emotional valence (Data extracted from other studies regarding the following variables are also included: Frequency and Orthographic neighbors)	9-point SAM scales 1= <i>calm / in control / unpleasant</i> ; 9= <i>excited / out of control pleasant</i>	–	doi: 10.3758/s13428-011- 0131-7
Soares et al. (2017) [MWP – Minho Word Pool]	3800	Nouns, adjectives, adverbs, verbs	2357 under- graduate students (Males=36%)	<i>M</i> <sub>Imageability</sub> =60.8 (range: 35-68); <i>M</i> <sub>Concreteness</sub> =57.0 (range: 32-62); <i>M</i> <sub>Frequency</sub> =56.7 (range: 42-77)	22.4 (5.0)	– Imageability – Concreteness – Subjective frequency (Data extracted from other studies regarding the following variables are also included: Part of speech / morpho-syntactic information, Objective frequency, Orthographic neighborhood and Orthographic Levenshtein distance)	7-point scales 1= <i>low imageability / low concreteness / never encountered that word</i> ; 7= <i>high imageability / high concreteness / encountered that word several times a day</i> – Correlation with norming data obtained in other studies (e.g., Balota et al., 2001; Marques, 2005)	– Words retrieved from P-PAL (Soares, Iriarte et al., 2014)	doi: 10.3758/s13428-016- 0767-4