Comments from Managing Board:

1) Data must be available to readers, either in the text or through an open data repository such as Zenodo (free), Dryad (pay) or some other institutional repository. Data must be reusable, thus metadata or accompanying text must carefully describe the data;

Our data is available on the OSF project archive.

2) Details on quantitative analyses (e.g., data treatment and statistical scripts in R, bioinformatic pipeline scripts, etc.) and details concerning simulations (scripts, code) must be available to readers in the text, as appendices, or through an open data repository, such as Zenodo, Dryad or some other institutional repository. The scripts or code must be carefully described so that they can be reused;

Our data is stored as jamovi files with the statistical tests included.

3) Details on experimental procedures must be available to readers in the text or as appendices;

The procedure was fully described in the methods, and our questionnaires are available on OSF.

4) Authors must have no financial conflict of interest relating to the article. The article must contain a "Conflict of interest disclosure" paragraph before the reference section containing this sentence: "The authors of this article declare that they have no financial conflict of interest with the content of this article.";

We added the declaration that we have no conflicts of interest.

5) This disclosure has to be completed by a sentence indicating, if appropriate, that some of the authors are PCI recommenders: “X is a recommender at PCI Registered Reports.”.

Neither author is a PCI recommender.

Comments from Chris Chambers

I think a nice addition to your paper to help readers quickly digest the conclusions would be an additional row in your research plan reporting in simple terms the outcome, i.e. whether each hypothesis was confirmed or disconfirmed (you could then rename the table to "Research plan and outcomes"). I will leave this as an option to consider (it is not mandatory).

We have renamed the section to "Research plan and outcomes" as advised, and added a row at the bottom of the table to show whether the hypotheses were confirmed or disconfirmed.

On a further minor note, there appears to be formatting issue with this table in which the Hypothesis row is duplicated at the top of each page -- is this intentional?

The hypothesis row is intentionally duplicated on top of each page for reference, because the table spans multiple pages.

Under Methods > Participants, the authors describe exclusion criteria related to prior diagnoses and depression experience. It isn't immediately clear to me whether these criteria were applied to the 201 participants remaining after filtering for incomplete questionnaires, described in the paragraph preceding the one I reference. I do see numbers adding up to 201 in Table 2, so unsure at what stage this filtering was implemented. Please ignore this if I misinterpreted the text or missed some crucial information on this elsewhere in the manuscript.

The filtering process was done prior to data collection and we made sure that all requirements are met before participants respond to our survey. This clarification was added to the Methods > Participants section.

This sentence on Page 12 needs to be corrected, perhaps by removing the bolded text: "Rumination tendency was measured using the 22-item Rumination Responsiveness Scale will be used" (and please check thoroughly for any other similar typos which can easily creep into Stage 2 submissions due to tense changes).

The sentence has been corrected.

Additional changes:

We removed some sentences reporting demographic information in the results section because it was redundant with Table 2.

We made some other minor corrections of grammar and wording.