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**Editor First Decision**: Revise & Resubmit

Mar 28, 2022

Dear Simen Bø,

First of all, I would like to apologize regarding the delay in receiving a decision on your manuscript, and I thank you for your patience.

I have now received all reviews of your manuscript, “Discrete Emotions Caused by Episodic Future Thinking: A Systematic Review With Narrative Synthesis” from qualified researchers, including someone who holds substantive expertise on the topic and another person whose expertise lies in conducting rigorous systematic reviews. I also independently read the manuscript before consulting these reviews. I agree that your manuscript has important strengths and also that there are some issues that need to be addressed. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.

The reviewers did an outstanding job in their reviews. Importantly, I would like you to thoughtfully attend to the issue raised by the first reviewer regarding the idea that aspects of the methodology (i.e., the kind of imagined events) might affect the emotions that are induced by episodic future thinking) and consider outlining specific future directions that might shed light on this issue. Furthermore, I think it is critical that you take into account the thorough feedback regarding the details and reporting of the systematic review methodology from the second reviewer.

In addition to the excellent comments by the reviewers, I noted some additional points:

* Bring up the aim of the mansucript earlier in the manuscript (e.g., in the second paragraph). Currently the first mention of the purpose of the manuscript is on p. 10.
* Consider creating a separate paragraph in the primary manuscript that succinctly summarizes deviations from the preregistration vs. having it interspersed in the manuscript.
* Include a short summary sentence regarding the content of the articles that were deemed to be near-misses somewhere in the primary manuscript.
* Revise the reporting of gender to also include the percentage of male participants, and any other gender identities if applicable.
* Consider turning the Eligibility Criteria section into a table for readability.
* On p. 38, add more information regarding how compassion might be considered to be the “counterpart to gratitude”.
* Refrain from using “excellent” as a descriptor of the Cohen’s kappa values and consider using “high interrater reliability” instead.
* One reference to include when discussing measures of discrete emotions might be a paper by Weidman, Steckler, and Tracy (2016; <https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Femo0000226>).

In your resubmission, please include a document with a point-by-point response to both the points I list here and the reviewers’ comments, outlining each change made in your manuscript or providing a suitable rebuttal.

In summary, I think this is a promising manuscript and, I hope you will revise it for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology. I look forward to receiving your revision.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at editorialoffice@collabra.org.

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Joanne M. Chung, PhD

**Reviewer 1**

**Open response questions**

Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

This article describes a systematic review of studies assessing the effects of episodic future thinking on discrete emotions. Twelve experimental studies were identified. Based on these, the authors argue that episodic future thinking consistently influences some discrete emotions (enjoyment and compassion) but that for other emotions the effect is either absent (e.g., anger, disgust, pride) or inconsistent (e.g., happiness, anxiety, fear, sadness).

The question of how episodic future thinking influences discrete emotions is clearly important for understanding how representations of the future influence decision making, motivation, and behavior. The authors’ argument based on appraisal theory is compelling and I commend them for the quality of their review (e.g., the use PRISMA-P guidelines, pre-registration, risk of bias assessment). Unfortunately, I am afraid there is not much information to be gleaned from this review, other than that there is a lack of research on the influence of episodic future thinking on discrete emotions. Indeed, the conclusions that can be drawn are limited by the small number of studies that were identified and by the fact that these studies were not designed to investigate the impact of episodic future thinking on discrete emotions. The authors conclude that episodic future thinking does not influence some emotions such as pride, anger, interest, disgust, and guilt. But the validity of this conclusion may depend on the type of future events being investigated. In fact, the main factor influencing discrete emotions may be the thematic content of imagined events. For example, it seems obvious to me that the kind of events that participants were asked to imagine in Van Boven and Ashworth (2007)'s study (e.g., thanksgiving, annoying noises) would not induce guilt, but that does not mean that guilt in general cannot be induced by episodic future thinking (e.g., imagining lying to a loved one). By contrast, compassion has been consistently detected perhaps because studies that investigated compassion asked participants to imagine someone needing help. Thus, I’m not convinced that some emotions are more frequently induced by episodic future thinking than others; it may simply depend on the kind of imagined events. In sum, the issue addressed in this article is clearly important but, unfortunately, the conclusions that can be drawn are too limited for me to recommend publication.

**Rating scale questions**

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

**Reviewer 2**

**Open response questions**

Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

**Overall Recommendation**

This is an informative, well-written and carefully conducted study that propely applies all aspects of the complex systematic review methodology to present new knowledge. In particular, the authors carry out comprehensive risk of bias assessments, as befits a knowledge synthesis that was designed to account for and control bias.

The article could benefit from, although does not require, minor changes that are highlighted in this review. This reviewer urges the authors to make these changes as they would elevate the already exemplary and novel work.

**Systematic or scoping?**

Since the authors are looking for the evidence of an effect of future thinking on emotions, this is congruent with the type of question for which systematic reviews are built. In a systematic review, one would seek information that can lead to decision-making. For example, this research question could be written as: “Is there evidence for an effect of future thinking on emotions? If yes, which emotions have been studied and what are the characteristics of emotional, episodic future thoughts.”

The correct type of knowledge synthesis has been chosen here.

This section is based on:
Munn, Z., Peters, M. D. J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18(1), 143–143. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>

**Introduction and Literature Review**

**Section “Cognitive Appraisals, Emotions, and Future Thinking”**

As a non-psychologist, this reviewer should perhaps refrain from making comments about the assumptions underlying some of the concepts presented in the Introduction, and their relationships to one another.

However, seeing that the section relates discrete emotions to mental states through the appraisal framework that clearly involves self-awareness of inner states and many other factors, this reviewer finds that this section would benefit from a statement connecting cognition and consciousness and the relationship that the authors assume exists - or might exist - between them.

While this could be a significant undertaking, an outline of the authors’ position would still be helpful. The authors’ earlier reference to phenomenology seems to imply they assume self-awareness and perhaps several kinds of consciousness, such as narrative consciousness. Such a discussion would also address any heuristics that might be at play in translating emotion into adaptive behaviours.

**Comments on Method**

**Synthesis section**

This section is excellent, clearly and correctly describing the differences between a meta-analysis and a systematic review.

**It would be helpful if the authors avoided the phrase “narrative review” in this section as a “narrative (literature) review” is a non-systematic review method.**
The authors may wish to emphasize the systematic nature of their work. The “narrative” descriptor is relevant only for their results reporting, not the study construction.

**Protocol and Pre-registration**

The authors are to be congratulated on creating a protocol and registering it on OSF. Systematic reviews require protocols. Prospero is another registry the authors could have selected. It has good visibility in the knowledge synthesis community.

Authors write: “The protocol followed PRISMA-P guidelines for systematic reviews (Moher et al., 2015).”

While the authors selected the correct PRISMA checklist, **the PRISMA-P extension is not a guideline. Thus, the above statement is not correct and should be changed.**

None of the PRISMA extensions are methods for **conduct**.

**All PRISMA extensions are mere checklists on what has to be reported in the protocol (PRISMA-P) and manuscript (PRISMA).** The PRISMA documents are fillable tables where authors list the page numbers of their document corresponding to content sections.

In the world of knowledge syntheses, the guidelines consist of narrative chapters in the *Cochrane Handbook*, or the *JBI (Joanna Briggs Institute) manual* for reviews.

While this might seem like a minor detail, the proliferation of similar statements in the literature propagates the misunderstanding of the difference between PRISMA checklists and narrative guidelines in the appropriate manuals.

**Eligibility Criteria**

Excellent detail.
Non-English language literature inclusion is commendable. Too many systematic reviews settle for a convenience sample of English-only, perpetuating the very biases that systematic reviews are to control.

**Literature Search and Study Selection**

The description of the databases used is very clear, including the platforms through which the databases were available. In addition to noting platforms such as OVID, the authors should state **which edition of MEDLINE they used,** as there are several versions with different update frequencies.

While the reviewer understands that the search aspect of this work is one that cannot be recreated at this point, there are improvement to the search methodology the authors should make when working on a future systematic or scoping review:

(1) **Was a PRESS - peer review of electronic search strategy - conducted?** A PRESS is a practice indended to review the search before it is finalized in the protocol and used to generate results. All researchers, including professional academic librarians, benefit from having experienced colleagues assess the quality of the search strategy. This assessment includes search translation (how well does it correspond to the research question and inclusion criteria), Boolean operators and logic structure, use of terms and thesauri (where appropriate), and the appropriateness of database selection

(2) While the databases used were good choices, EMBASE, a medical database focused on interventions, could have been another choice rather than MEDLINE. A test search should have assessed the appropriateness of database choice.

(3) While listing search terms is very useful, and a common practice in reporting systematic reviews, showing the main search is more useful as the logical structure of the search is revealed. The search strategy is, arguably, as important as the list of terms. A mistake in Boolean logic, or some poorly chosen proximity operators, can prevent valuable terms from being included. **Not publishing the search makes the study not reproducible.** This reviewer would urge the main database search to be published as an appendix.

(4) Was any software chosen to facilitate screening?

**Risk of Bias Assessment**

Excellent section.

**PRISMA Flowchart**

Excellent description of the process.

**Comments on Results**

Clear, comprehensive tables.

**Comments on Discussion**

The authors open this section with an effective paragraph, only to follow it with this sentence, at the start of the second paragraph: “This review is the first systematic, comprehensive assessment of the effects of episodic future thinking on discrete emotions.” This should be stated earelier and more prominently as it is a testament to the significance and novely of this work.

**Comments on Limitations**

A comprehensive section.

**Reviewer’s background**

The reviewer focuses on evaluating the methodological aspects of the systematic review process.

If the authors are interested in working with an information professional such as an academic librarian on some of the highlighted sections, they are urged to contact one at their institution. If none come forward, the authors are welcome to contact this reviewer, a research librarian at the University of Toronto Mississauga, in Canada, at: Joanna Szurmak, joanna.szurmak@utoronto.ca

**Rating scale questions**

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

**Author Response**
Apr 8, 2022

**General comment**

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for their thorough, systematic and excellent work with giving feedback on our manuscript. Through incorporating the comments from the editor and the reviewers, we believe the manuscript has been substantially improved. Below we outline the specific comments from the editor and the reviewers, and the ways in which we have changed the manuscript accordingly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Editor** | **Author response** |
| Bring up the aim of the mansucript earlier in the manuscript (e.g., in the second paragraph). Currently the first mention of the purpose of the manuscript is on p. 10. | *The aim of the manuscript is now described in a third paragraph, after the introduction of “episodic future thinking” as a main concept on the first page of the Introduction.*  |
| Consider creating a separate paragraph in the primary manuscript that succinctly summarizes deviations from the preregistration vs. having it interspersed in the manuscript. | *We have added more text to the paragraph on the pre-registration on p. 13 to emphasize the main deviations from the pre-registration that were in the main manuscript, and kept the reference to the separate appendix (which now has a full description of all deviations, including the ones that were previously in the main manuscript).*  |
| Include a short summary sentence regarding the content of the articles that were deemed to be near-misses somewhere in the primary manuscript. | *A short summary sentence has been included that describes the main reasons for the exclusion of the “near-misses” on p. 20.*  |
| Revise the reporting of gender to also include the percentage of male participants, and any other gender identities if applicable. | *Table 3 in the manuscript has been updated accordingly, as has the supplementary revised data collection sheet. Please be advised that percentage of male participants was not reported for many of the articles, and other gender identities were unavailable in most of the articles. This was mainly because the researchers did not typically report the number of categories used in their measure of gender.*  |
| Consider turning the Eligibility Criteria section into a table for readability. | *We thank the editor for this suggestion. Several of the eligibility criteria (e.g., specific thoughts about the future) are difficult to summarize in table form, because they require further elaboration in order to describe how they were implemented in the screening process (see the last few sentences in the first paragraph of “Eligibility Criteria”). Therefore, we have chosen to keep the information in paragraphs in the text. However, we have added a sentence to summarize the main points of the inclusion criteria in the last paragraph (p. 14).*  |
| On p. 38, add more information regarding how compassion might be considered to be the “counterpart to gratitude”. | *We have added more information about the relationship between gratitude and compassion.* |
| Refrain from using “excellent” as a descriptor of the Cohen’s kappa values and consider using “high interrater reliability” instead. | *The descriptions have been changed, and all three instances of Cohen’s kappa reporting are now reported in the following manner: “and the interrater reliability was high (Cohen’s kappa of X.XX).”* |
| One reference to include when discussing measures of discrete emotions might be a paper by Weidman, Steckler, and Tracy (2016; https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Femo0000226). | *The reference has been included in the discussion section on measuring discrete emotions on p. 59, in a sentence which summarizes the implications of a widespread use of one-item, unvalidated, self-report measures in emotion science.*  |
| Importantly, I would like you to thoughtfully attend to the issue raised by the first reviewer regarding the idea that aspects of the methodology (i.e., the kind of imagined events) might affect the emotions that are induced by episodic future thinking) and consider outlining specific future directions that might shed light on this issue. | *We have added a new section in the Limitations in the Discussion (p. 59) concerning the content of the imagined scenarios, as outlined below. We have also added a sentence in the first paragraph in the Future Research section (p. 60), outlining that authors could both focus on cognitive appraisals and systematically manipulating the content of future thinking to assess effects on presently experienced emotions.*  |
| **Reviewer #1:** | **Author response** |
| Unfortunately, I am afraid there is not much information to be gleaned from this review, other than that there is a lack of research on the influence of episodic future thinking on discrete emotions. Indeed, the conclusions that can be drawn are limited by the small number of studies that were identified and by the fact that these studies were not designed to investigate the impact of episodic future thinking on discrete emotions. | *We agree with the reviewer that definite conclusions about the effects of episodic future thinking on all discrete emotions is limited by the available literature. While it is not uncommon for systematic reviews with narrative synthesis on psychological topics to have 1-20 articles for the synthesis (e.g., Archer et al., 2021; Emerson et al., 2017; Golding et al., 2017; O’Donovan & McAuliffe, 2020; McCabe et al., 2018; McDermott et al., 2012), we agree that it would be possible to reach more definite conclusions with a larger, available literature. However, we respectfully disagree with the reviewer on two points. First, identifying a lack of research, reasons for the lack of research, and theoretically grounded suggestions for future research is a valuable contribution from a systematic review. Second, we believe we can reach fairly clear conclusions regarding the effects of episodic future thinking on compassion and enjoyment, which we believe to be a valid conclusion about the effects of future thinking on discrete emotions. Thus, while we agree that there are limitations to the conclusions in the review, we still believe it to hold considerable informational value.*  |
| The authors conclude that episodic future thinking does not influence some emotions such as pride, anger, interest, disgust, and guilt. But the validity of this conclusion may depend on the type of future events being investigated. In fact, the main factor influencing discrete emotions may be the thematic content of imagined events. Thus, I’m not convinced that some emotions are more frequently induced by episodic future thinking than others; it may simply depend on the kind of imagined events. In sum, the issue addressed in this article is clearly important but, unfortunately, the conclusions that can be drawn are too limited for me to recommend publication. | *To acknowledge this important point, we have added a new section (“Imagined Scenarios and Discrete Emotions”) concerning the content of the imagined scenarios in the Limitations in the Discussion on p. 59-60. We emphasize that we cannot confidently conclude that episodic future thinking does not affect certain emotions, but that there seems to be some selectivity in the effects of future thinking that go beyond the effects of the imagined scenarios (i.e., the difference between compassion and distress).*  |
| **Reviewer #2:** | **Author response** |
| (…) seeing that the section relates discrete emotions to mental states through the appraisal framework that clearly involves self-awareness of inner states and many other factors, this reviewer finds that this section would benefit from a statement connecting cognition and consciousness and the relationship that the authors assume exists - or might exist - between them.While this could be a significant undertaking, an outline of the authors’ position would still be helpful. The authors’ earlier reference to phenomenology seems to imply they assume self-awareness and perhaps several kinds of consciousness, such as narrative consciousness. Such a discussion would also address any heuristics that might be at play in translating emotion into adaptive behaviours. | *A sentence has been added on p. 9 to emphasize that there is common agreement about the possibility of cognitive evaluations occurring both unconsciously and consciously, and that the conscious aspect may be particularly linked to the phenomenological experience of episodic future thinking.*  |
| It would be helpful if the authors avoided the phrase “narrative review” in this section as a “narrative (literature) review” is a non-systematic review method.The authors may wish to emphasize the systematic nature of their work. The “narrative” descriptor is relevant only for their results reporting, not the study construction. | *The relevant paragraph on p. 12 has been changed accordingly, with the terms “systematic review” used to describe the article and the term “narrative synthesis” used to describe the process for synthesizing the results.*  |
| Authors write: “The protocol followed PRISMA-P guidelines for systematic reviews (Moher et al., 2015).”While the authors selected the correct PRISMA checklist, the PRISMA-P extension is not a guideline. Thus, the above statement is not correct and should be changed.None of the PRISMA extensions are methods for conduct.All PRISMA extensions are mere checklists on what has to be reported in the protocol (PRISMA-P) and manuscript (PRISMA). The PRISMA documents are fillable tables where authors list the page numbers of their document corresponding to content sections.In the world of knowledge syntheses, the guidelines consist of narrative chapters in the Cochrane Handbook, or the JBI (Joanna Briggs Institute) manual for reviews.While this might seem like a minor detail, the proliferation of similar statements in the literature propagates the misunderstanding of the difference between PRISMA checklists and narrative guidelines in the appropriate manuals. | *The language in the relevant paragraph on p. 13 has been changed, and it is made clear that the PRISMA-P is not a guideline, but a checklist.*  |
| In addition to noting platforms such as OVID, the authors should state which edition of MEDLINE they used, as there are several versions with different update frequencies. | *It is now noted in the manuscript on p. 15 that the complete Ovid MEDLINE version was used.*  |
| While the reviewer understands that the search aspect of this work is one that cannot be recreated at this point, there are improvement to the search methodology the authors should make when working on a future systematic or scoping review: | *We thank the reviewer for outlining pertinent issues for the search methodology that may be improved in future systematic reviews. As the reviewer notes, the search aspect cannot be recreated at this point, meaning that we cannot make many changes based on this comment. However, we have highlighted the changes that were possible in the responses below.*  |
| Not publishing the search makes the study not reproducible. This reviewer would urge the main database search to be published as an appendix. | *Unfortunately, while the number of records from the main database search is noted in the PRISMA Flowchart, the main database search itself (a link to the website with the search) has not been stored. However, the complete search strategy described for one database in the pre-registration (Appendix S1) is the exact search strategy that was used for that database.*  |
| Was any software chosen to facilitate screening? | *Microsoft Excel was used to facilitate screening. A sentence describing this fact has been added in the description of screening, below Table 2 on p. 16 of the manuscript.*  |
| The authors open this section with an effective paragraph, only to follow it with this sentence, at the start of the second paragraph: “This review is the first systematic, comprehensive assessment of the effects of episodic future thinking on discrete emotions.” This should be stated earelier and more prominently as it is a testament to the significance and novely of this work. | *The sentence has been moved to the section in the Introduction labelled “Aim of the Current Review” on p. 11, thus being allocated a more promising place in introducing the review as a whole.*  |
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**Editor First Decision**: Revise & Resubmit

Apr 12, 2022

Dear Simen Bø,

Thank you for submitting a revised version of your manuscript, “Discrete Emotions Caused by Episodic Future Thinking: A Systematic Review With Narrative Synthesis”. I appreciate your thoughtful responses to the initial reviews. After reviewing the manuscript, I have decided not to send the revision out for further review. There are two minor issues that need to be addressed. I encourage you to address these issues and submit a revised version of your manuscript to Collabra: Psychology.

In your resubmission, please include a document with a response to the point I list here, outlining the change made in your manuscript or providing a suitable rebuttal. I look forward to receiving your revision.

1. Please explicitly state that although you are not able to share the database search record, the preregistration includes the search strategy. Please also include the actual preregistration link in the manuscript and modify the corresponding text on p. 13.
2. Sometimes references to the Appendix are capitalized and sometimes they are not. Please check this for consistency throughout the manuscript.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at editorialoffice@collabra.org.

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

Joanne M. Chung, PhD
University of Toronto, Mississauga

**Author Response**
Apr 13, 2022

**General comment**

We would like to thank Editor Chung for the final comments on the manuscript. Below we outline the two specific comments and the ways in which we have changed the manuscript accordingly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Editor** | **Author response** |
| Please explicitly state that although you are not able to share the database search record, the preregistration includes the search strategy. Please also include the actual preregistration link in the manuscript and modify the corresponding text on p. 13. | *We have now included the following sentence in the “Literature Search and Study Selection” section in the Methods section on p. 15: “Although we are not able to share the database search record, we specify the number of records identified in the databases in our PRISMA Flowchart in the Results section. Additionally, the preregistration includes the full search strategy.” Additionally, we have included the pre-registration link in the text on p. 13 and removed the text identifying it as a pre-registration text, and not the actual pre-registration.*  |
| Sometimes references to the Appendix are capitalized and sometimes they are not. Please check this for consistency throughout the manuscript. | *The manuscript has been checked for consistency regarding the appendices, and they are now all described using Appendix/Appendices. The Appendices have also been changed following the removal of the anonymized pre-registration text for peer review (Appendix S1), so that the remainder are Appendices S1-S6.*  |

**Editor Final Decision:** Accept

Apr 13, 2022

Dear Simen Bø,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “Discrete Emotions Caused by Episodic Future Thinking: A Systematic Review With Narrative Synthesis”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to the concerns that the reviewers and I raised. I am happy to say that your paper is now officially accepted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. Congratulations on this excellent work, I think it will make an important contribution to the literature and I look forward to seeing it published! I hope your experiences with Collabra: Psychology have been positive and that you will continue to consider it as an outlet for your work.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point.

You will be receiving separate correspondence regarding any production and technical comments, data deposits, as well as publication charges. We work with the Copyright Clearance Center to process any applicable APC charges. Please note that your APC transaction must be completed before your article gets published.

You will have an opportunity to check the page proofs before we publish your article. Thank you again for publishing in Collabra: Psychology.

Sincerely,
Joanne Chung