# Supplementary Material

**The results of the other three items:**

**Experiment 1**

**Evaluation task**

As for the other three items (glove, desk lamp and bicycle lock), the evaluation of them were also analyzed by ANOVA with the frame (WTA and WTP frame) and tDCS stimulation type (anodal, cathodal and sham) as “between-subjects” factors. Neither a main effect of frame [Glove: F (1, 153) = 0.018, p = 0.895, partial η2 < 0.001; Lamp: F (1, 153) = 0.037, p = 0.848, partial η2 < 0.001; Lock: F (1, 153) = 0.735, p = 0.393, partial η2 = 0.005] or stimulation type [Glove: F (1, 153) = 1.677, p = 0.190, partial η2 ＝ 0.021; Lamp: F (1, 153) = 0.407, p = 0.667, partial η2 ＝ 0.005; Lock: F (1, 153) = 0.569, p = 0.567, partial η2 ＝ 0.007] nor a significant interaction effect involving the frame and stimulation type [Glove: F (1, 153) = 1.465, p = 0.234, partial η2 ＝ 0.019; Lamp: F (1, 153) = 1.708, p = 0.185, partial η2 ＝ 0.022; Lock: F (1, 153) = 1.040, p = 0.356, partial η2 ＝ 0.013] was observed.

**Experiment 2**

**Evaluation task**

We also tested the evaluation of the other three items (glove, desk lamp and bicycle lock) by repeated ANOVAs with the frame (WTA and WTP frame) as a “between-subjects” factor and tDCS stimulation type (anodal, cathodal and sham) as a “within-subjects” factor. Neither a main effect of frame [Glove: F (1, 58) = 0.672, p = 0.416, partial η2 ＝ 0.011; Lamp: F (1, 58) = 0.771, p = 0.384, partial η2 ＝ 0.013; Lock: F (1, 58) = 0.981, p = 0.326, partial η2 ＝ 0.017] or stimulation type [Glove: F (1, 58) = 0.032, p = 0.858, partial η2 ＝ 0.001; Lamp: F (1, 58) = 0.624, p = 0.433, partial η2 ＝ 0.011; Lock: F (1, 58) = 0.031, p = 0.861, partial η2 ＝ 0.001] nor a significant interaction effect involving the frame and stimulation type [Glove: F (1, 58) = 2.460, p = 0.122, partial η2 ＝ 0.041; Lamp: F (1, 58) = 1.671, p = 0.201, partial η2 ＝ 0.028; Lock: F (1, 58) = 2.354, p = 0.130, partial η2 ＝ 0.039] was observed.