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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors have properly addressed my concerns. The manuscript has improved substantially. I only indicate some little modifications in citing references in the text.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

As I stated in the first revision of the manuscript, the Authors should revise the citations in the text as this example:

P5, L39. Garret & Sharot (Garrett & Sharot, 2017) reported that people alter their beliefs to a… Should be: Garret & Sharot (2017) reported that people...

Please, revise these other, with the same structure:

P6, L1. But Korn et al. (Korn, Sharot, Walter, Heekeren, & Dolan, 2014) demonstrated that

P6, L10 Meevissen et al. (Meevissen, Peters, & Alberts, 2011) reported increased optimism and positive future

P6, L13 Miranda et al. (Miranda, Weierich, Khait, Jurska, & Andersen, 2017) conducted a similar study and found that dysphoric participants

P8 L6 According to Sharot et al. (Sharot et al., 2014), the difference between participants

P10 L56 Miranda et al. (Miranda et al., 2017) demonstrated that optimism can be induced by using mental imaging. Jefferson et al. (Jefferson et al., 2017) argued that unrealistic

P12L7 Soderstrom et al. (Soderstrom, Davalos, & Vázquez, 2011) reported that

Based on Miranda et al. (Miranda et al., 2017), we

These data are not consistent with Korn et al. (Korn et al., 2014) which demonstrated a differential update bias between patients with depression and healthy participants.

Also, please, correct this one:

P6L39 (see (Kendall, Hollon, Beck, Hammen, & Ingram, 1987)). Participants were recruited

Should be: (see Kendall, Hollon, Beck, Hammen, & Ingram, 1987). Participants were recruited
Alos, please correct these:

P6 L56 measured with the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D) (Radloff, 1977).

Should be: P6 L56 measured with the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977).

P7 L35 (LOT-R) (Scheire, Carver, & Bridges, 1994) were measured before and after the conditions.

Should be: P7 L35 (LOT-R; Scheire, Carver, & Bridges, 1994) were measured before and after the conditions.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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