Reviewer #1: The authors have done an excellent job in revising the paper, especially in tightening the introduction and making the methods and results more accessible to a broader audience. There are three issues that I would urge the authors to address in a revision:  
  
1. In the abstract and the first part of the introduction, there is an emphasis on "emotional expression" as the underlying change mechanism for expressive writing. There really is very little evidence for this. There are several studies that have argued that expressive writing works because of cognitive change, habituation, emotional expression, cognitive dissonance, etc. The evidence for inhibition is also quite flimsy. I don't think the authors want to get into this argument since it isn't the real point of the paper. My strong recommendation would be to simply replace "emotional expression" to "expressive writing" or "emotional writing" or something like this. Also, reduce the discussion of inhibition to a sentence suggesting that it is one of many possible mechanisms relevant to change.

**Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Indeed, an argument for a certain mechanism of change is beyond the scope of this meta-analysis. We have replaced “emotional expression” with “expressive writing” in the abstract and introduction. Additionally, we have reduced the discussion of inhibition to a single sentence, providing examples of additional proposed mechanisms aside from imaginal exposure.**   
  
2. The logic of looking at the experimental groups independent of the control groups is clearer. However, in reading the results, the temporal dimension of psychological change was obscured by the statistics. In fact, I didn't realize that the temporal changes for PTS and PTG had completely different trajectories compared with QOL until the discussion. Be more explicit about the analyses that show this while discussing them in the results section. Remember that most readers are not as enamored with the elegant statistics as you are. Most are trying to figure out what the statistics mean. In other words, explicitly mention how the various measures are changing over time in the months after the interventions

**We are unclear what you are asking for in this comment. Results between different dependent variables are not compared until the discussion (to maintain clarity which variables are being discussed in each section). The PTG and PTS results show null effects and QOL showed negative correlations across time (information in discussion around page 27) and each correlation is listed in its respective result section under Other Estimates. It would be difficult to claim that they are different trajectories based on the confidence intervals of these correlations crossing zero (i.e., it’s not clear for PTS and PTG what these might be, but likely they are close to nil, and the confidence intervals overlap).**

3. On pages 19 to 21, detailed statistics are provided about homogeneity, power, and other meta-analytic measures relevant to p-hacking, etc. Please toss in a few sentences alert the readers if these numbers are good, bad, a relief, or worrisome. The discussion does a good job in providing a broad perspective but within the results themselves, most readers won't know how to think about the results. We don't need details but just orient us to what is normal.

**We have added a sentence at the end of each of these paragraphs on each of the outcome variable sections.**   
  
The authors should be commended in putting together such an impressive project.  
  
  
  
Reviewer #2: Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to review this manuscript once again. The authors were generally responsive to many of my concerns. I appreciated that the authors provided more information on what makes their study particularly novel in the introduction and discussed the potential importance of even a small effect size.  
The manuscript is in much better shape. I wanted to suggest a couple of additional points which I don't think are necessary but I feel could strengthen the manuscript.

1) The manuscript is written for a very technical audience and seems to fit better with a methods journal. I think spending a little more time interpreting some of the effects they found could enhance the readability for the general audience that reads RGP.

**We’ve added more of an explanation on interpreting the effects for PTS, PTG, and QOL in the discussion section, tying this into conceptualizations from recent literature to explain discrepant or null effects.**

2) Introduction discusses PTG but gives a very general description of the mechanism. Please describe 1-2 of the most dominant accounts for the benefits of PTG and how expressive writing might promote this mechanism. The sentence, "208 Pennebaker & Graybeal (2001) suggested that expressive writing allows one to feel more connected with their surroundings" was used verbatim twice.

**Nice catch! We’ve fixed the verbatim phrasing. Additionally, we have added more about the conceptualization from Tedeschi’s work into this part of the introduction.**

3) Please provide greater detail in your explanation for the discrepancy between the results and other studies showing that individuals with subclinical symptoms benefit more.

**We’ve added some more information on possible explanations for this discrepancy in the discussion section.**