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Dr. Jessica D. Payne, Associate Editor
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Dear Dr. Payne and reviewers,

Thank you for the thoughtful feedback contained within your decision letter dated February 05th, 2023 and the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript (XGE-2023-1118). We have revised our manuscript in accordance with the reviewer comments and organized those changes in the appended document. Like last time, all comments are numbered and organized by reviewer and gravity, for ease of identification. Both clean and tracked-change copies of our manuscript are included with this most recent submission.

Please also note that this revision reframes what was previously referred to as our “Pilot Study” to a “Preliminary Study”. This change was not prompted by reviewer comments. However, we believe this change is small but important, as it more accurately reflects the intentions motivating and value provided by the study that preceded the studies contained in this manuscript. Of course, if this causes any concern, please let us know.

We believe that our revision addresses all concerns cited by the reviewers and has certainly increased the quality of the manuscript. Again, we appreciate both your time and the time of the reviewers and we look forward to your assessments of this most recent version of our manuscript.

All the best,

William Mitchell

Doctoral Candidate, Psychology & Neuroscience Department

Temple University

William.J.Mitchell@temple.edu

**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 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).”

1. “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.

1. “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 can isolate differences in the processes. We added an additional discussion in the limitations to note constraints with this study design (i.e., Forecasters experienced stimulus, etc.) to meet your concerns. This confusion regarding experience and usage and forecasting prompted us to take a closer look at our labeling of these conditions. We think relabeling exposure to “usage” and maintaining forecasting as “forecasting” might clear up this confusion, as usage more clearly denotes what regulation process that we are focusing on rather than being potentially confused with the stimulus type.

1. “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 with your suggestion and have noted this in the aforementioned addition to the limitation section.

1. “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 corrected any points of confusion.

1. “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.