

March 25, 2025

Dear Editors,

We would like to thank you and the three reviewers for the time and effort you have invested in evaluating our revised Stage 1 registered report manuscript entitled “Impact of Acute Stress Exposure on Reactivity to Loss of Control Over Threat”. We appreciate the reviewers' recognition of the manuscript's improvements based on their insightful feedback.

In the following, we want to address the remaining comments of reviewer 3 (Mariela Mihaylova). The reviewer's comments appear in grey, while our responses are indented, labeled with "**Response**" in bold, and shown in black. All page numbers below refer to the revised manuscript with marked changes.

We hope that you will find our responses satisfactory, and that the manuscript will be suitable to be granted Stage 1 in principle acceptance. As stated, following the submission of our revision on February 12, 2025, we initiated data collection based on a revised protocol that fully incorporated the methodological feedback and suggestions from the initial round of review. Since the submission, no changes have been made to the protocol, except for minor wording adjustments now addressed by reviewer Mariela Mihaylova. We have not accessed any data for processing or analysis purposes.

Sincerely,

Michalina Dudziak

on behalf of all coauthors

Review by Mariela Mihaylova

Thank you to the authors for their detailed and thoughtful responses to the reviews. I am particularly glad to see the attempt at better powering the study. I think in an ideal world you would follow Brysbaert's recommendation for between-subject effects ($N = 200$) but the increase made here can only help you find better evidence for your hypotheses.

Response: We appreciate your recognition of our efforts to improve the study's power. Your insights have been crucial in refining our approach.

Just a small note that line 135 still says 96 participants (hasn't been updated to 128).

Response: Thank you for noticing this small mistake in the manuscript. We have now updated the number of participants to 128 in lines 35, 36, 135, and 136.

I think you can make it even more explicit which hypotheses are your main ones and which are additional — in the responses, you wrote H6-8 are secondary but the paper seems to say that everything after H5 are secondary (line 154).

Response: We would like to apologize for the discrepancy between the manuscript and the response letter. We have now clearly stated in the manuscript that only hypotheses 6 to 8 are classified as secondary (lines 170-174).

Re hypothesis 8, I am glad the authors added a specific hypothesis for this but I still think the results won't really tell you much even if you find an association. I would just advise that you make it more explicit that any results found here should be approached with caution at Stage 2.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer's concern, and we will make sure to approach any evidence we find in relation to hypothesis 8 with caution at Stage 2.

Re the connection to real-world evidence, I didn't see where this was added in tracked in the intro but happy for the authors to expand more on it in the discussion at Stage 2.

Response: Regarding the real-world evidence, we apologize for any confusion we may have caused. We did not include potential long-term implications of our study in the

manuscript but only mentioned them in our previous response letter. As noted, we will address this topic in the discussion section at Stage 2.

Re the unpublished study on line 138, can the authors add a link to the OSF repository you mentioned in the reply? I think that will help it be less vague.

Response: Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have now included the OSF repository link (<https://osf.io/b72yk>) to the preregistration of our unpublished study (line 162) in the main manuscript.

Once these minor updates are made, the paper is good to be conducted from my side and I don't need to review it again. I wish the authors good luck with the study and would be happy to review the paper again at Stage 2.

Response: Thank you for your thoughtful review of our Stage 1 manuscript. We appreciate your feedback, especially regarding the power analysis. We are also grateful for your willingness to review the paper again at Stage 2 and look forward to your insights at that stage.