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We thank the reviewers for their encouraging helpful comments. Herein, we provide a point-by-point response to the comments.

**Reviewer #1: Dr. Kasper**

*Abstract, Results: Use the singular for “effect”.* We have done so here, as well as for the title.

**Reviewer #2: Dr. Partonen**

*Page 4, Methods. Which were the exact exclusion criteria.* We have now explicitly listed these criteria.

*Page 5, line 6. Please name and describe these tests.* We have listed what was measured and included further information that only 12 subjects were assessed. Further detail would detract from the present paper, in our view.

*Page 6, line 9... Should read “anxiolytic”.* We made this change.

*Page 6, line 11. Please state if the distribution of the data was normal.* We have stated that the data were normally distributed.

*Page 6, Results. Please confirm whether the total number was 104.* We have confirmed that total n=104.

*Page 6, Results. Please give the exact number for older and younger subjects.* We now note that there were n=33 and 46, older and young subjects, respectively.

*Page 6, Results and Page 7. Please give the 95% CI for the effect sizes.* We have given the 95% CI for all of these effect sizes.

*Authors may want to cite the study by Partonen and Lönnqvist.* We have done so and briefly discussed the findings of this study.

**Reviewer #3: Dr. Levitan**

*A more comprehensive outline of inclusion and exclusion criteria is needed.* We have included a comprehensive description of these criteria. We note that depression and other mental health problems were exclusions, based on a questionnaire, but that subjects were not given a formal psychiatric interview.

*It should be emphasized more strongly that the study sample was limited to very healthy individuals. The lack of a subgroup between 31-58 is*
also an issue to mention. We have more clearly emphasized the limited sample, and, as suggested, noted that the low anxiety might be partly explained by lack of subjects ages 31-58 years.

The 3-hr period between assessments might have masked or contributed to the effects noted. We have added that there were no time of day differences in baseline anxiety or response to light, which argues against this hypothesis.

Did the subjects with “clinical levels of anxiety” have formal DSM-Defined anxiety disorders? We note that they did not.

Reviewer #1: Dr. Kasper

Abstract, Results: Use the singular for “effect”. We have done so here, as well as for the title.