REVIEWER A

I have reviewed the manuscript entitled "Interpersonal effects of emotion in a multi-round Trust Game". This research tests the effect of happy, anger and neutral partners´ faces in cooperative responses in multi-round Trust Games. Happy and neutral partners generate higher levels of trust when their emotional facial expression is presented as social cue. However when facial expression are presented as "non associated to partner" or in a bias-inconsistent behaviour, facial expressions did not predict cooperation responses.

I recommend the publication of this manuscript after addressing some concerns and in case, including them in the new version.

1.- I recommend the use of specific emotional categories instead of positive or negative emotions in all the manuscript. Results have been obtained using happy, anger and neutral faces but these data can´t be extended directly to other emotions. Negative emotions as sadness may have the same influence as happiness in cooperative behaviour or positive emotions as proud may influence in a similar way as anger. It is not correct use the terms positive and negative emotions in a global form (for example in page 5 hypothesis 3 or in general discussion in page 14).

2.- Please, explain better what do you mean in hypothesis 2 (p.5) by non-social emotions.

3.- Please explain why results are similar between happy and neutral conditions in Experiment 1. You concluded in Discussion section "participants cooperated more with happy partners than with those displaying neutral or angry facial expressions" (p.8). However your results showed marginal differences between happy and neutral condition, and in the block 5 clearly this difference was not significant. Why no-emotion has a similar meaning of happiness, could be the negative emotional bias?

4.- Could the "partial reinforcements of naive theories" explain the effect of cooperation in Experiment 1 after repeated lack of evidence that emotions are of any use in the game? Learned behaviours are acquired more slowly with partial reinforcement, but the response is more resistant to extinction.

Minor concerns:

- Please use italics in statistical nominations as *p, F*

- Explain if participants in all studies had normal or corrected to normal vision (you inform about that only in study 2).

- In page 4 Please use "she/he" to explain the task. Sometimes you use only she and others times you use he

Pilar Carrera
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

REVIEWER B

El artículo es interesante y vale la pena ser publicado. La presentación del problema y la discusión de los efectos del feedback, etc están OK pero el texto tiene una óptica muy específica que debe ser ampliada.

Modificaciones y aclaraciones necesarias:

1.- Dar indicadores de tamaño del efecto y no solo la significación

2.- Poner los resultados básicos (%, etc. en estudio 2 y no solo decir que no son significativos)

3.- Dado los bajos grados de libertad confirmar que los requisitos para análisis paramétricos se dan (con 13 por grupo y además medidas intra se exige mucho a los datos). Si no se dan (homocestacidad, igualdad de varianzas) aplicar técnicas menos exigentes o no paramétricas H de Kruskal Wallis p.e.

4.- Hacer una integración meta-analítica usando r o phi del efecto de cara feliz y contingencia (usando resultados 1+2+3 simultáneamente)

5.- Discutir porqué enojo decrece más que felicidad aumenta cooperación (diferencias de 16% frente aumento 5%) en el marco de la asimetría positivo negativo afecto-percepción (Baumesteir et al) y funciones y motivos diferentes enojo y alegría (ambas emociones de aproximación pero de valencia negativa; Scherer et al, Keltner et al)

6.- No limitarse ni poner como elemento central el AESI. Hay una pandemia de modelos muy limitados y que responden más a una necesidad cultural de distintividad que a reales diferenciaciones científicas Mirar modelos más generales de emoción y toma de decisiones.

Dario Paez
Universidad del País Vasco