

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewers 1 and 2:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: High

Novelty: High

Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors: Be as accurate as possible when making your comments. List each recommendation so that it is easy for authors to respond appropriately to each one. Indicate in a timely manner where changes should be made (i.e. paragraph 2 of the method section).

INTRODUCTION

1. The introduction is well written.

METHODS

2. Please complete the information on the ethics committee that approved the study protocol. The manuscript states:

"The project was approved by the Ethics Committee of [HIDDEN FOR PEER REVIEW]."

RESULTS

3. There is an error in Figure 2 because the items of the dimension "expressive suppression" are repeated.

4. The manuscript presents interesting results, however, the use of factorial invariance between groups, for example between men and women (by sex) or by age groups, would help to make it more robust.

DISCUSSION

5. In the limitation sub-section, it is necessary to indicate that they have no sensitivity or specificity values.

6. It is suggested to add a sub-section on public health or clinical practice implications. In order to identify the applicability of the results in the health context.

Interacciones seeks greater transparency in the review process and to provide credit to reviewers. If the editors decide to accept the manuscript, **would you like your name to appear as a reviewer of the article?**

No

AUTHORS' RESPONSE

The authors would like to thank the editorial team and the anonymous reviewers, whose feedback has allowed us to significantly improve the manuscript. In the revised document, changes are marked in red.

Reviewers' comments	Changes made
1. The introduction is well written.	1. Thank you. No change was made.
2. Please complete the information on the ethics committee that approved the study protocol. The manuscript states: "The project was approved by the Ethics Committee of [HIDDEN FOR PEER REVIEW]."	2. Done. It has been replaced by "The project was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Master's and Doctoral Program in Psychology of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México."
3. There is an error in Figure 2 because the items of the dimension "expressive suppression" are repeated.	3. We are very grateful to the reviewer for bringing this important error to our attention. Figure 2 has been corrected.
4. The manuscript presents interesting results, however, the use of factorial invariance between groups, for example between men and women (by sex) or by age groups, would help to make it more robust.	4. We agree with the reviewer that an invariance analysis is desirable and would make the study more robust. However, in our case it was not possible, because we only had approx. 90 males in our sample. This would prevent us from obtaining reliable estimates for this group if we were to perform an invariance analysis. This was already described in the Limitations: "the small number of male participants prevented us from performing an invariance analysis with regard to sex."
5. In the limitation sub-section, it is necessary to indicate that they have no sensitivity or specificity values.	5. At the end of the Limitations sub-section, we added a comment on the lack of sensitivity and specificity values.
6. It is suggested to add a sub-section on public health or clinical practice implications. In order to identify the applicability of the results in the health context.	6. Done. A whole sub-section on this topic has been added just before the Conclusion.