**Reviewer 1 Feedback:**

1. In Study 1, the authors discuss their hypotheses related to 'intensity' as if intensity was an independent variable that's being manipulated (as it is in Gal Sheppes foundational work) but this may not be appropriate in Study 1. In this study, intensity is a measured variable (not a manipulated one) and in this particular study context, it's very likely an outcome of regulation just as much as it's a predictor of regulation. For example, another way to interpret figure 4 is that - rather than this being an unexpected finding - it might be exactly what one would predict if emotional intensity was the \*outcome\* of regulation success, which it very well could be given that these variables were measured at approximately the same time: as regulation success decreased, emotional intensity increased.

**Our response:**

1. For this reason, I wouldn't necessarily feel comfortable with this take-home message, which makes it sound like the present results are the opposite of what prior work has demonstrated: "Though the extant literature from comparable lab studies should motivate us to expect the efficacy of distraction to increase and reappraisal to decrease as affective intensity increases, our data seems to document a deviation from this pattern in a high-intensity, quasi-naturalistic setting: distraction appeared to be less - not more - successful as affective intensity increased."

**Our response:**

1. Aside from this moderation effect, the main effect between intensity and strategy choice was the primary analysis in this study, and there was no reliable/significant association found. That could be informative but, given the nature of the study, I'm not sure how informative this null association is. If emotional intensity drives use of distraction vs. reappraisal, we'd expect a positive association between intensity and distraction use. But if [lower] emotional intensity is also the \*outcome\* of successful regulation - especially distraction, which was the modal strategy used - we'd expect a negative association between intensity and distraction use. These two patterns operating at once could yield a null result, which could explain Study 1 findings.

**Our response:**

1. This alternative interpretation also tracks with what the authors found in Study 2: when new participants are told that a given event is higher vs. lower intensity (i.e., intensity is manipulated here, rather than measured like in Study 1), they choose distraction (vs. reappraisal) more often. This is essentially a conceptual replication of the Sheppes work because intensity is manipulated (i.e., given to participants) and isn't really comparable to the intensity variable in study 1, which is a complex experience that is likely being affected by regulation as much as it's affecting regulation. For this reason, Study 2 can't effectively be used to help explain the pattern of results from Study 1.

**Our response:**

1. The authors then conducted Study 3 to learn whether the link between intensity and distraction choice (vs. reappraisal choice) would be present in forecasted regulation contexts (like Study 2) but not in executed regulation contexts (like Study 1). But by my read, this isn't the core difference in the findings between Study 1 and 2 and so when I saw that the experimenters were again manipulating intensity in Study 3 (this time with pre-piloted lower vs. higher intensity film clips), it seemed fully reasonable for them to replicate the 'canonical relationship' between intensity and distraction, which they did. This pattern makes good sense if Study 2 and 3 are interpreted as solid conceptual replications of the original Sheppes work, where intensity is carefully manipulated for participants.

**Our response:**

**Reviewer 4 Feedback:**

No comments