Reviewer 2 Feedback:

No comments

Reviewer 4 Feedback:

Major Comments

1. "The effectiveness of the different strategies measured is referred to throughout the manuscript and the authors have included mention of the effectiveness of distraction in the introduction of the current manuscript (p. 5), but caution should be taken as not all the studies cited in the introduction regarding distraction being more effective than reappraisal have measured this. Therefore, this should be edited to make this clearer. Also, the authors could expand this point expand to highlight that distraction is thought to be more effective than reappraisal in response to high-intensity situations because it is an early selection strategy that is implemented before emotional information is represented in working memory (Sheppes & Gross, 2011; Sheppes et al., 2014)."

   Our response: We have updated our discussion of strategy comparisons to more clearly delineate each study's focus and contributions to the topic. Our discussion on Page 5 now reads: "This supposition is bolstered by the especially robust influence of emotional intensity upon strategy choice, as distraction is chosen more often (Hay et al., 2015; Orejuela-Dávila et al., 2019; Sheppes et al., 2011; Young & Suri, 2020) and is more effective (Shafir et al., 2016) than reappraisal in response to high intensity stimuli …". We additionally added the recommended point about the proposed mechanism through which distraction is more effective: "… at least in part because it can be deployed before relevant emotional information has been represented in working memory (Sheppes et al., 2014; Sheppes & Gross, 2011) and requires fewer cognitive resources (Dorman Ilan et al., 2019)."

2. "The rationale for why participants were asked to avoid sharing thoughts, reactions and experiences with other participants and to act and react as naturally as possible without interacting with each other in Study 1 (p. 14) should be explicitly stated. This is because it could be argued that interacting with others might be a way of regulating one's own emotions when experiencing a shared situation, like the participants are in Study 1."

   Our response: Thank you for highlighting this. We have elaborated further, noting that we wanted to avoid participants influencing one another's affective assessments and memories of the events before they could be recorded and that the design was not setup well to study social support as an emotion regulation strategy.

3. "It is great to see the inclusion of the third study which compares experiencers and forecasters strategy use and prediction respectively. My understanding is that in this study, all participants watched the video clips and then those in the experiencer condition were asked to report which strategy (if any) they used to regulate their emotions and those in the forecaster condition were asked to predict what strategy they thought the average person would use to regulate their emotions in response to the video they had watched. Firstly, for those in the forecaster condition, why were they also exposed to the stimuli instead of a description (like in Study 2)? As they experienced the stimuli, I am hesitant about the differences between the experiencer and forecaster conditions that were identified and I think this point should be discussed within the manuscript. "

   Our response: Thanks for asking this question. From our perspective, a hurdle in comparing the results of Study 1 and Study 2 was that not only were participants engaging in (potentially) different regulation processes (i.e., forecasting v. usage), but that what they were deploying these processes in response to differed as well (i.e., haunted house v. descriptions of haunted house). By keeping the stimulus constant, we intended to isolate differences in forecasting what one would do (or would have done) in an emotion eliciting situation with what one actually did do in the same situation. While we could have varied the stimuli between the conditions again as well, we believe we would have ran into

a similar issue regarding the magnitude of confounds present, which we felt limited our conclusions. Additionally, we could have varied the stimuli while keeping the regulation perspective process the same (i.e., forecasting to descriptions v. forecasting to experiences), but we considered this to be tangential to our primary research question (how emotion regulation strategies are used during "complex, multimodal events") – though potentially an interesting alternative project in its own right The event descriptions in Study 2 served the purpose of acting as a contrast to the haunted house experiences because of the noted limitations of that preliminary study.

We have added an additional discussion in the limitations to note constraints inherent to the study design that we chose (i.e., Forecasters experienced stimulus, etc.) to meet your concerns. Your comment also highlighted that the labels we originally chose in Study 2 (i.e., experiencers and forecasters) do not fit the design of Study 3 as well as we would like. As such, we've revised these labels throughout the manuscript, such that "experiencers" are now labeled as "Strategy Users" and forecasters are still "Strategy Forecasters. Believe that this framing is more consistent, simple, easier to follow, and representative of the focus of these studies.

4. "Additionally, in Study 3, there seems to be a discrepancy between what participants are being asked to do (i.e., predict which strategy they think they average person would have used) and the reminders they received about the strategies. More specifically, participants were asked to select which strategy they predict the average person would use, whereas the reminders seem to suggest they are selecting the strategy that the average person should use. There are differences between what people think they should do and what they would do - for example, when regulating emotions after a stressful day people may think they should do one thing (e.g., go for a run to clear their mind) but what they actually do might be different (e.g., treat themselves to a glass of wine). Thus, it is possible that these differences in language could have impacted the responses the participants gave in this condition and is a methodological limitation of the current work and therefore could explain the differences found and thus at least warrant discussion."

   Our response: Thank you for noting this. We agree that this is a potential issue and have followed your suggestion to discuss how this limits our interpretation of the results in the aforementioned addition to the limitation section.

5. "When discussing the findings from Study 3, make sure that the differences between the experiencers and forecasters are explicitly stated. For example, when referring to the findings from the forecasters, this should be focusing on predictions, not usage (e.g., on p. 43). This should be applied throughout."

   Our response: We have reviewed all of our discussion on the matter and believe we have corrected any points of conflict or confusion.

6. "The authors switch between using the terms 'study' and 'experiment' to refer to the research in the current paper. For consistency, the authors should use one term throughout."

   Our response: We have revised our terminology when referring to research contained within this paper. All references to such use 'study' for consistency.