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Reviewer's report:

Dear author,

Thank you for updating the manuscript according to the reviewers' suggestion. There are few minor things that need further clarification:

1. Results (pg. 11) - We examined change in the dysphoria and optimism before and after the manipulation for each dysphoria group in a three way (2 x 2 x 2) ANOVA (Condition: induced optimism vs. control x dysphoria group: low, mild, high x time: pre-manipulation vs post manipulation. Should it be 2 x 3 (dysphoria group: low, mild, high) x 2 ?.

2. Discussion (pg. 13) line 22 -" Participants in the mild dysphoria group who participated in the induced optimism condition however, showed a high update bias rather than a low one compared to the high dysphoria group" - The sentence compared to the high dysphoria group does not make sense, are you comparing the between the low and high dysphoric group here or are you comparing the mild group to the high dysphoria group?. - Please rewrite this.

3. Conclusion - Given that no significant different was found between intervention vs control conditions - there is no evidence to support that the induced optimism training can help to increase optimism in the future. Although differences were reported in the intervention condition, the main point is if you received the induced program vs no induced program - the outcomes on dysphoria and optimism scores were not significantly different.
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