

Supplemental Material S1. Comparison of the HC, RHD, and TBI participants.

Table S1a. Comparison of the sociodemographic and neuropsychological data between the healthy control (HC), individuals with right hemisphere damage (RHD), and individuals with traumatic brain injury (TBI).

	RHD		TBI		HC		Test statistic		RHD vs HC	TBI vs HC	RHD vs TBI
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i> -value (η_p^2)	<i>Post-hoc p</i> -value (Cohen's <i>d</i>)	<i>Post-hoc p</i> -value (Cohen's <i>d</i>)	<i>Post-hoc p</i> -value (Cohen's <i>d</i>)
Age	57.50	5.72	46.16	11.75	51.09	11.10	4.766	.034 (.131)	.099	.227	.006
Time post-onset (month)	45.93	37.23	62.32	74.13	-	-	0.574	.585	-	-	-
Digit SPAN (forward)	8.14	1.99	8.05	2.44	9.76	2.50	4.03	.056	-	-	-
Digit SPAN (backward)	6.14	1.34	7.21	2.10	8.55	2.04	8.229	.006 (.207)	.000 (0.683)	.068	.180
RST SPAN	2.29	0.83	2.58	0.77	2.85	0.62	3.230	.099	-	-	-
RST (total words)	14.29	7.22	17.53	9.27	20.03	6.73	2.854	.121	-	-	-
Letter fluency (D + F)	20.50	9.01	22.53	6.85	27.03	7.40	4.381	.044 (.122)	.035 (0.827)	.077	.594
Hayling (automatic)	6.14	0.54	5.95	0.78	6.48	0.51	5.112	.027 (.140)	.105	.014 (0.868)	.569
Hayling (inhibition)	7.50	3.30	8.68	2.83	11.55	1.89	15.600	.000 (.331)	.006 (1.697)	.006 (1.259)	.392
Mini-SEA (total)	23.71	10.23	27.74	8.24	33.79	4.62	10.841	.000 (.256)	.011 (1.495)	.021 (0.981)	.328
Mini-SEA (faux-pas)	16.15	7.80	18.47	7.64	23.91	4.59	8.869	.000 (.222)	.014 (1.373)	.008 (0.925)	.552
Mini-SEA (control)	9.38	1.26	9.26	1.66	9.88	0.49	2.164	.209	-	-	-

Note. *p*-values adjusted with the False Discovery Rate (FDR) method using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure; the bold font indicate significant differences between the groups.

Table S1b. Correct responses to the questions on the speaker's intent and to the control questions in each condition for the healthy control (HC), individuals with right hemisphere-damage (RHD), and individuals with traumatic brain injury (TBI).

	EF demand	Cue	RHD		TBI		HC	
			M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Questions on the speaker's intent								
Lit.	Low		3.64	1.28	3.79	1.58	4.42	1.28
	High		3.57	1.28	3.68	1.73	4.39	1.14
Hint	Low	No	3.64	1.45	3.32	1.92	4.88	0.96
		With	3.50	1.56	3.68	2.16	4.91	0.91
	High	No	3.71	1.59	2.95	2.15	4.30	1.26
		With	3.64	1.69	3.42	2.12	4.97	1.05
Control questions								
Lit.	Low		5.43	0.65	5.58	0.77	5.76	0.44
	High		5.50	0.52	5.42	0.90	5.73	0.52
Hint	Low	No	5.57	0.65	5.84	0.38	5.82	0.53
		With	5.64	0.50	5.53	0.70	5.91	0.29
	High	No	5.71	0.47	5.63	0.50	5.82	0.39
		With	5.36	0.63	5.79	0.54	5.82	0.39

Group comparisons on hint comprehension: Hint with no contextual cue versus Literal

Questions on the speaker's intent

The 3 (Group: RHD, TBI, HC) × 2 (Context: Literal, Hint) × 2 (EF demand: Low, High) repeated measures ANOVA on the number of correct responses to the questions on the speaker's intent showed a main effect of group, $F(2, 63) = 9.653, p < .001; \eta_p^2 = .235$, with the RHD participants having a significantly worse performance than the HC participants (FDR-corrected $p < .02$) and the TBI participants having a significantly worse performance than the HC participants (FDR-corrected $p < .001$). There was no significant difference between the RHD and TBI participants (FDR-corrected $p > .05$). There was no main effect of context, $F(1, 63) = 0.309, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .005$, and no main effect of EF demand, $F(1, 63) = 1.552, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .024$. No interactions were significant.

Control questions

The 3 (Group: RHD, TBI, HC) × 2 (Context: Literal, Hint) × 2 (EF demand: Low, High) repeated measures ANOVA on the number of correct responses to the control questions showed no main effect of group, $F(2, 63) = 2.752, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .080$, no main effect of context, $F(1, 63) = 4.792, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .071$, and no main effect of EF demand, $F(1, 63) = 0.225, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .004$. No interactions were significant.

Group comparisons on hint comprehension: Hint with a contextual cue versus Hint with no contextual cue

Questions on the speaker's intent

The 3 (Group: RHD, TBI, HC) × 2 (Cue of hint: Without, With) × 2 (EF Demand: Low, High) repeated measures ANOVA on the number of correct responses to the questions on the speaker's intent showed a main effect of group, $F(2, 63) = 9.670, p < .001; \eta_p^2 = .235$, with the RHD participants having a significantly worse performance than the HC participants (FDR-corrected $p < .02$) and the TBI participants having a significantly worse performance than the HC participants (FDR-corrected $p < .001$). There was no significant difference between the RHD and TBI participants (FDR-corrected $p > .05$). There was no

main effect of the cue, $F(1, 63) = 3.381, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .051$, and no main effect of EF demand, $F(1, 63) = 1.666, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .026$. No interactions were significant.

Control questions

The 3 (Group: RHD, TBI, HC) \times 2 (Cue of hint: Without, With) \times 2 (EF Demand: Low, High) repeated measures ANOVA on the number of correct responses to the control questions showed no main effect of group, $F(2, 63) = 3.596, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .102$, no main effect of the cue, $F(1, 63) = 1.581, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .024$, and no main effect of EF demand, $F(1, 63) = 0.358, p > .05; \eta_p^2 = .006$. No interactions were significant.