Reviewer comments and point by point responses

We would like to thank the reviewer and the editors for their kind and appreciative comments regarding our paper. We considered their advice and changed the manuscript according to their suggestions. In the following, we comment the recommendation and explain how we addressed them in our revised manuscript. All changes are tracked in the manuscript file.

Reviewer #1

1. If this study is a meta-analysis, why is it not included in the title?

   Response: The Title is now reformulated as follows:

   „Thinking about Worry: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis on the Assessment of Metacognitions in Children and Adolescents."

2. The method was well written and the discussion was good, but the charts were many and some of them were superfluous and not necessary, like Figure 3. Please reduce the number of tables and graphs

   Response: We reduced the number of graphs by removing „Figure 3 Years of publication of the included studies ($k = 48$)".

   To reduce the number of tables, we suggest removing „Table 3 Summary of results for random effect models for meta-analysis on correlational coefficient on measures of POS/NEG and worry/anxiety" because most information of this table can be found in the maintext of the result section as well as in the forest plots. We also suggest to provide our largest table „Table 1 Overview of studies included in the systematic review" as supplementary material. We leave the final decision to the editior.

3. Minor language polishing

   Response: The manuscript text was edited for English language by medical editor Carole Cürten and a Certificate of Editing was issued. This certificate was submitted to WJP. Additionally, the manuscript was double checked from another highly educated native-English speaker.

Science Editor

1. Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations that are closely

related to the topic of the manuscript, and remove other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated.

Response: The used meta-regression tool Meta-Mar was cited, with Christiansen H being one of the authors (Beheshti A, Chavanon M-L, Albrecht B, Christiansen H. Meta-Mar: a free online meta-analysis service. *under Rev J Educ Psychol Meas*). Another cited study (Esbjørn BH, Normann N, Christiansen BM, Reinholdt-Dunne ML. The efficacy of group metacognitive therapy for children (MCT-c) with generalized anxiety disorder: An open trial. *J Anxiety Disord* 2018;**53**:16–21 [DOI: 10.1016/j.janxdis.2017.11.002]) was authored by Christiansen BM, an author from another working group. Overall, we used one self-cited reference, and the self-referencing rate is 1.01%.

2. The authors need to provide the Biostatistics Review Certificate, and PRISMA 2009 Checklist.

   Response: The Biostatistics Review Certificate, and PRISMA 2009 checklist are now submitted.

3. The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

   Response: The PowerPoint document with original figures is now submitted. Because the Forest plots are adjusted PDF outputs from RevMan, we unfortunately cannot provide reprocessable graphs and text for these figures.

4. PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

   Response: The reference list was revised and all available PMID and DOI numbers are now provided.

5. The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.

   Response: The Arcticle Hightlights section is now added at the end of the main text.