**Supplement**

**Table S1**

*Frequency of current diagnoses in the MD group.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Current comorbid diagnosis |
| *n* | % |
| Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder | 1 | 5.0% |
| Separation anxiety disorder | 1 | 5.0% |
| Specific anxiety disorder | 7 | 35.0% |
| Social anxiety disorder | 5 | 25.0% |
| Agoraphobia | 1 | 5.0% |
| Anorexia nervosaa | 1 | 5.0% |
| Obsessive-compulsive disorder | 1 | 5.0% |

*Note*. aBMI > 10th percentile at time of assessment.

**Table S2**

*Spearman-Brown-corrected split-half reliabilities for the percentage of dwell time spent on negative pictures*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Condition/focus | Cronbach’s α |
| Dwell time negative attend, emotional focus | .796 |
| Dwell time negative reappraise, emotional focus | .440 |
| Dwell time negative attend, non-emotional focus | .528 |
| Dwell time negative reappraise, non-emotional focus | .719 |

**Table S3**

*Percentage of dwell time (*M*,* SD*) spent fixating highlighted squares.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Experimental condition | MD adolescents(*n* = 20) | TD adolescents(*n* = 28) | *p*-value |
| **emotional/central focus** |  |  |  |
|  neutral attend  | 96.08 (*2.10*) | 94.69 (*3.91*) | .156 |
|  positive attend  | 93.26 (*3.39*) | 91.67 (*5.63*) | .266 |
|  negative attend  | 93.55 (*3.38*) | 90.78 (*5.25*) | .044 |
|  negative reappraise  | 91.36 (*4.33*) | 90.54 (*4.80*) | .546 |
| **non-emotional/peripheral focus** |  |  |  |
|  neutral attend  | 90.95 (*3.63*) | 88.59 (*4.89*) | .074 |
|  positive attend  | 89.18 (*5.46*) | 84.66 (*7.07*) | .021 |
|  negative attend  | 85.91 (*5.27*) | 81.59 (*8.66*) | .054 |
|  negative reappraise  | 86.18 (*6.53*) | 82.41 (*8.54*) | .104 |

*Abbreviations*: MD = Major Depression; TD = Typically developing.

**Relationships between ER success and questionnaire data**

In neither of the two groups we found significant correlations between ER success in the emotional and non-emotional gaze focus condition, respectively, and the tendency to give socially desirable answers (as measured with the SDS-17; *p*s≥.563).

All correlations between ER success in the emotional and non-emotional gaze focus conditions and habitual ER strategies (as assessed with the FEEL-KJ) were non-significant in both groups (all *p*s≥.095).

ER success in the two gaze focus conditions did not significantly correlate with the severity of the depressive symptomatology in MD adolescents (as assessed with the BDI-II; *p*s≥.121).

**Detailed results on gaze behavior over time**

To investigate gaze patterns over time, we splitted the 7-second picture presentation duration into 7 epochs each lasting 1 second. The 2(group)×2(gaze focus condition)×7(epoch) mixed-model ANOVA for the “reinterpret” instruction revealed a significant main effect of epoch (*F*(6,144.82)=134.73, *p*<.001, *ƞp2*=.745). Post-hoc *t*-tests revealed a significant increase in dwell time between second 3 and 4 (*p* =.015) and second 5 and 6 (*p*=.002). No significant main effect of group was found (*F*(1,46)=1.64, *p*=.207, *ƞp2*=.034). However, there was a significant interaction between group and gaze focus condition (*F*(1,46)=4.62, *p*=.037, *ƞp2=*.091). Post-hoc independent *t*-tests revealed that dwell times were comparable between groups in both the emotional and non-emotional gaze focus condition (both *ps*≥.109, emotional: *d*=0.11, non-emotional: *d*=0.33). To further investigate the interaction, we then calculated the difference scores between the percentages of dwell time spent on emotional vs. non-emotional picture aspects during reinterpretation for each group. The post-hoc independent *t*-test indicated a lower difference score in depressed than in healthy adolescents (*t*(46)=2.09, *p*=.042, *d*=-0.61). The other interactions involving group were non-significant (*F*s≤0.59, *p*s≥.736). Moreover, we found a significant interaction between epoch and gaze focus condition (*F*(4.30,197.84)=74.72, *p*<.001, *ƞp2*=.619) (see Figure 3). When participants’ gaze was directed to emotional picture aspects a decrease in dwell time between second 2 and second 3 (*p*=.001, *d*=0.44), and increases in dwell time between second 3 and seconds 4, 6, 7, respectively, (*p*s*≤* .022, *d*s≥0.34), second 4 and second 7 (*p*=.01, *d*=0.40), and second 5 and seconds 6, 7, respectively (*ps≤*.032, *d*s≥0.31) were found (see Figure 3). With respect to the non-emotional gaze focus condition, significant increases in dwell time were found between second 2 and seconds 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, respectively (*p*s*≤*.033, *d*s≥0.24), second 3 and seconds 6, 7, respectively, (*p*s*≤*.019, *d*s≥0.44), and second 5 and seconds 6, 7, respectively (*p*s*≤*.033, *d*s≥0.29) (see Figure 3). There was also a main effect of gaze focus condition (*F*(1,46)=95.35, *p*<.001, *ƞp2*=.675), with higher dwell times in the highlighted square in the emotional (*M*=90.60%, *SD*=7.32%), as compared with the non-emotional gaze focus condition (*M*=83.70%, *SD*=10.33%).

The 2(group)×2(gaze focus condition)×7(epoch) mixed-model ANOVA for the “attend” instruction indicated a main effect of group (*F*(1,46)=4.58, *p*=.038, *ƞp2=*.090), with higher dwell times in the MD (*M*=89.26%, *SD*=6.90%) than in the TD group (*M*=85.59%, *SD*=10.02%). The main effect of gaze focus condition was also significant (*F*(1,46)=148.23, *p*<.001, *ƞp2*=.763), with higher dwell times in the emotional (*M*=91.61%, *SD*=7.28%), as compared with the non-emotional gaze focus condition (*M*=82.62%, *SD*=10.87%). Moreover, the ANOVA revealed a main effect of epoch (*F*(6,147.74)=83.31, *p*<.001, *ƞp2*=.644). Further analyses revealed significant increases in dwell time between second 2 and seconds 5, 6, 7, respectively (*p*s≤.025, *d*s≥0.32), second 3 and seconds 4, 5, 6, 7, respectively (*p*s≤.002, *d*s≥0.34), second 4 and seconds 5, 6, 7, respectively (*p*s≤.041 *d*s≥0.23), and second 6 and 7 (*p*=.029, *d*=0.27). All interactions involving the factor group were found to be non-significant (all *F*s≥0.62, all *p*s≥.193). We found a significant interaction between epoch and gaze focus condition (*F*(6,4.40)=130.72, *p*<.001, *ƞp2*=.740) (see Figure 3). When participants focused their gaze on emotional picture aspects, a decrease in dwell time was observed between second 2 and seconds 3, 4, respectively (*ps*≤.010, *d*s≥-0.47), as well as increases in dwell time between second 3 and seconds 6, 7, respectively (*p*s≤.010 *d*s≥0.50), and second 5 and second 7 (*p*=.029, *d*=0.50; see Figure 3). With regard to the non-emotional focus condition, significant increases in dwell time were found between second 2 and seconds 4, 5, 6, 7, respectively (*p*s≤.008, *d*s≥0.13), second 2 and second 5 (*p*<.001, *d*=0.66), second 2 and 6 (*p*<.001, *d*=0.83), 2 and 7 (*p*<.001, *d*=1.02), second 3 and seconds 4, 5, 6, 7, respectively (*p*≤.002, *d*s≥0.42), second 4 and seconds 6, 7, respectively (*p*s≤.007, *d*s≥0.47), and second 5 and second 7 (*p*=.002, *d*=0.54; see Figure 3).