**Peer Review of Sparacio et al. (2023) Stage 2 Registered Report by Siu Kit YEUNG**

For this paper, since the Stage 1 RR for intro and method has been accepted and are very well done, my review focuses on results and discussion only. Great draft, interesting and important findings, thank you!

**Results**

1. The authors excluded effects of d = 2.00 or above. This sounds reasonable, but any justification regarding the cutoff based on past research papers? If not, the author can also state the d > 2.00 cut-off is arbitrary. Also, would be great if the authors add citations for the papers with d > 2.00.
2. I think for Hedges g, as it is possible for the value for go over 1.0, there needs to be leading zeros.

**Discussion**

1. Regarding the risks of biases, error, other research quality issues of the literature, the authors may connect the findings to generally prevalent problems in the Health Psychology literature and call for implementations of Open Science practices (e.g. see Hagger, 2019; Norris et al., 2022; Yeung, 2023)
2. The authors may consider adding a section on Open/Meta Science practices in Health Psychology, future directions for improvement, and/or future Open/Meta Science work needed (e.g. checklists, error/reproducibility check by journals, as in *Meta Psychology*, more assessments of different health psychology literatures)
3. Regarding the weak effects or null findings (with publication bias correction) for social support, I suggest discussing the following further:
4. How are the findings related to or different from the literature of social support, mental health, mental health conditions, and subjective well-being? For example, you may discuss similarities and differences between mental health, mental health conditions, subjective well-being, and stress, in terms of definitions, operationalizations and measurements, as well as the possible relationships/lack of relationships with social support
5. How are stress related outcome variables or stress related studies included in this meta-analysis, different from the outcome variables of other meta-analyses that investigated the association between social support and stress (e.g. Chu et al., 2010; Harandi et al., 2017; Thorsteinsson & James, 1999)? For example, correlational versus interventional?
6. The above suggestions and questions may also apply to the associations between nature exposure and stress, and nature exposure, subjective well-being, mental health, and mental health conditions.
7. Apart from adding paragraph(s) about these issues (which would be great), the authors may consider adding a table and/or a figure to facilitating explanation and illustrations.
8. The authors discussed some methodological, data reporting, and error explanations for null finding of emotional social support on stress, which are reasonable, but any other plausible explanations for these findings?
9. The authors may discuss further regarding future research directions on the potential effect of emotional social support on stress regulation, mental health conditions, mental health, and psychological well-being?
10. Regarding age distribution of studies, I wonder how many % of studies consist of substantial proportion of elderly participants (60 years or above, or 65 years or above)? In my recent Open/Meta-Science assessment (Yeung, 2023) of the health message framing literature (a Social-Health Psychology topic), only ~10% of studies consist of substantial elderly samples. This may have theoretical and practical implications as emotional social support may be more effective for older people, based on Socioemotional Selectivity Theory by Carstensen et al. (1999), and it seems plausible that older people would be more engaged in nature exposure interventions, but I am unaware of related evidence (let me know if there is).
11. Up to the authors and the editor, not necessary, but may be worthwhile to run an exploratory non-pre-registered moderator analyses for age.
12. Having a separate “Future Research Directions” section would be great, in terms of addressing research gaps (e.g. more studies with elderly samples, more studies with non-mid-to-high-income-country samples), improving reporting, transparency and reproducibility of research in the litearture. I know some of these issues are already discussed in the submitted manuscript, but having a subtitle and a section that discuss these issues would be clearer.
13. Regarding benefits of Registered Report format, the authors may cite Soderberg et al. (2021).
14. “3 in the United States, 1 in Poland, 1 in Malaysia, 4 in the United Kingdom, 1 in Japan, 1 in Finland, 1 in Germany, 1 in China, 1 in the Netherlands, 1 in South Korea, 1 in China, 1 in Italy, and 1 in Denmark” (p. 10) - 1 in China or 2 in China?
15. “there was a slight effect of gender” (p. 9) – please specify the direction of findings
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