**Supplemental Materials**

**Participant Compensation**

 Participating parents and adolescents received modest monetary compensation in exchange for their time and efforts. Specifically, each participant could receive up to $24 at the baseline assessment ($12 for questionnaires, $12 for ESM) and up to $40 at the 12-month assessment ($20 for questionnaires, $20 for ESM). Participants were required to complete at least 50% of ESM surveys in order to receive the full study payment. Participants who completed between 25% and 50% of ESM surveys earned 50% of the total payment (i.e., $6 at baseline and $10 at 12-month follow up). Participants were not compensated for completion of monthly questionnaires. To incentivize study engagement and participant retention across the follow-up period, two $50 Amazon gift cards were awarded each month via a lottery system. Participants received one lottery entry per each battery of questionnaires completed. Participants received additional entries for each day that they completed 100% of ESM surveys in order to promote high levels of survey completion. One winning child and one winning parent were randomly selected each month.

**Sample Equations**

Sample equations corresponding to analyses associated with Aim 1 (i.e., examining predictors of parental responses to adolescent positive affect in daily life settings). Please note that sample equations use parental enhancing as the outcome for demonstrative purposes; analogous analyses were conducted using dampening as the outcome.

Model 1

Level 1:

$$(Parental Enhancing)\_{ij}= β\_{0j}+e\_{ij}$$

Level 2:

$$β\_{0j}= γ\_{00}+γ\_{01}\left(Parental Depressive Symptoms\right)\_{j}+ u\_{0j}$$

Model 2

Level 1:

$$\left(Parental Enhancing\right)\_{ij}= β\_{0j}+e\_{ij}$$

Level 2:

$$β\_{0j}= γ\_{00}+γ\_{01}\left(Parental Anhedonia\right)\_{j}+ u\_{0j}$$

**Power Analyses**

Power analyses were conducted *a priori* using Monte Carlo simulations in Mplus v8.6 (Muthén & Muthén, 2021) to evaluate power in the present work, given anticipated sample size and study design. Estimated mean, intercept, variance, and effect size values were generated based on previous literature on related constructs (e.g., Griffith et al., 2021; Griffith et al., 2023). For Study 1, results of simulations over 5000 replications indicated that the present sample size (N=139, average 80% (n=25) surveys completed) was adequately powered at >80% to detect small to moderate effects (β≥.25) of parental depressive symptoms and trait anhedonia on parental responses to youth positive affect. Similar power was detected for the effects of parental responses to youth positive affect on linear trajectories (i.e., slopes and intercepts) of emotional development (power >80% for βs≥.25). Power for effect sizes of βs≥.25 were slightly lower for Study 3 MSEM analyses examining associations between growth trajectories and parental responses to youth positive affect in daily life settings at 12-month follow up (power = approximately 77% to 79% for intercepts and slopes, respectively). Power for Study 3 analyses examining prospective associations between youth growth trajectories and parental psychopathology was estimated to be similar in magnitude (approximately 77-80%). Thus, results of power analyses indicated that the present work had adequate power to detect meaningful effect sizes given the available sample size and analytic methods.

**Results of Exploratory Analyses: Associations between Parental Symptoms and Youth Odds of Sharing a Positive Event**

To evaluate the extent to which parental mood characteristics influence the likelihood that youth disclose positive events, a series of multilevel logistic regressions were conducted in which youth positive event disclosure (0=no disclosure, 1=disclosure) at each survey was regressed on parental symptoms of depression and trait anhedonia. Small effects of parent-reported parental depressive symptoms (*b*=.06, SE=.03, *p*=.074, OR=1.06) and trait pleasure (*b*=-.02, SE=.01, *p*=.065, OR=.98) on youth-reported odds of disclosing a positive event to their parent in daily life were observed, although these effects did not reach statistical significance according to traditional thresholds of *p*<.05. The direction of effects indicated that youth whose parents were higher in depressive symptoms and trait anhedonia were slightly more likely to share a positive event with their parent relative to youth whose parents were lower in these traits. No effects of parental symptoms or anhedonia were detected on parent-reported odds of youth daily-life positive event disclosure.

**References**

Griffith, J. M., Clark, H. M., Haraden, D. A., Young, J. F., & Hankin, B. L. (2021a). Affective

Development from Middle Childhood to Late Adolescence: Trajectories of Mean-Level

Change in Negative and Positive Affect. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 50*(8), 1550-

1563. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-021-01425-z>

Griffith, J. M., Farrell-Rosen, T. S., & Hankin, B. L. (2023). Daily life positive affect regulation

in early adolescence: Associations with symptoms of depression. *Emotion, 23*(3), 664–677. [https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0001129](https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/emo0001129)

**Table S1**

Univariate Growth Curve Model Fit Statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model Type | CFI | RMSEA [95% CI] | SRMR | AIC | BIC | χ2 (df) | Robust Δχ2 (df) | *p* |
| **Youth Depressive Symptoms** |
| No-growth | .85 | .11 [.11, .12] | .08 | 237610.33 | 237655.45 | 4441.11 (76) |  |  |
| Linear | .89 | .10 [.10, .10] | .06 | 235672.69 | 235727.48 | 3170.45 (73) | 123.26 (3) | <.001 |
| Quadratic  | .92 | .09 [.09, .09] | .05 | 234631.18 | 234698.86 | 2481.66 (69) | 671.67 (4) | <.001 |
| **Youth Positive Affect** |
| No-growth | .83 | .13 [.13, .14] | .14 | 272363.44 | 272408.56 | 6087.09 (76) |  |  |
| Linear | .89 | .11 [.11, .11] | .07 | 269884.28 | 269939.07 | 4042.99 (73) | 1427.33 (3) | <.001 |
| Quadratic  | .90 | .11 [.11, .11] | .07 | 269464.24 | 269531.92 | 3694.15 (69) | 334.85 (4) | <.001 |
| **Youth Negative Affect** |
| No-growth | .85 | .11 [.10, .11] | .07 | 232100.68 | 232145.80 | 3939.06 (76) |  |  |
| Linear | .86 | .11 [.10, .11] | .07 | 231714.55 | 231769.34 | 3630.25 (73) | 307.59 (3) | <.001 |
| Quadratic  | .88 | .10 [.09, .10] | .06 | 231199.99 | 231267.67 | 3218.14 (69) | 410.28 (4) | <.001 |

*Note.* CFI=comparative fit index; RMSEA=root mean square error of approximation; 95% CI=95% confidence interval; SRMR=standardized root mean square residual; AIC=akaike information criterion; BIC=sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criterion; df=degrees of freedom.

**Table S2**

*Best Fitting Growth Curve Model Parameters*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | β | b  | SE | p |
| **Youth Depressive Symptoms** |
| *Means* |
| Intercept | 1.41 | 4.41 | .05 | <.001 |
| Linear Slope | -.11 | -.07 | .01 | <.001 |
| Quadratic Slope | .21 | .01 | .001 | <.001 |
| *Covariances* |
| Intercept with Linear Slope | -.12 | -.26 | .06 | <.001 |
| Intercept with Quadratic Slope | .16 | .03 | .01 | <.001 |
| Linear Slope with Quadratic Slope | -.96 | -.04 | .002 | <.001 |
| *Variances* |
| Intercept | --- | 9.74 | .27 | <.001 |
| Linear Slope | --- | .47 | .03 | <.001 |
| Quadratic Slope | --- | .003 | <.001 | <.001 |
| **Youth Positive Affect** |
| *Means* |
| Intercept | 5.96 | 24.35 | .08 | <.001 |
| Linear Slope | -.08 | -.07 | .02 | .001 |
| Quadratic Slope | -.08 | -.01 | .002 | .003 |
| *Covariances* |
| Intercept with Linear Slope | -.26 | -.97 | .11 | <.001 |
| Intercept with Quadratic Slope | .29 | .09 | .01 | <.001 |
| **Table 4.4 (cont.)**Linear Slope with Quadratic Slope | -.93 | -.05 | .004 | <.001 |
| *Variances* |
| Intercept | --- | 19.64 | .59 | <.001 |
| Linear Slope | --- | .70 | .04 | <.001 |
| Quadratic Slope | --- | .01 | <.001 | <.001 |
| **Youth Negative Affect** |
| *Means* |
| Intercept | 3.25 | 9.10 | .05 | <.001 |
| Linear Slope | .09 | .05 | .01 | <.001 |
| Quadratic Slope | -.10 | -.004 | .001 | <.001 |
| *Covariances* |
| Intercept with Linear Slope | -.30 | -.48 | .06 | <.001 |
| Intercept with Quadratic Slope | .24 | .03 | .01 | <.001 |
| Linear Slope with Quadratic Slope | -.98 | -.02 | .002 | <.001 |
| *Variances* |
| Intercept | --- | 7.85 | .27 | <.001 |
| Linear Slope | --- | .32 | .02 | <.001 |
| Quadratic Slope | --- | .002 | <.001 | <.001 |

*Note.* β=standardized effect size; b=unstandardized effect size; SE=standard error of the unstandardized effect size.

**Table S3**

*Results of Multilevel Models Evaluating Associations between Parental Trait Anticipatory and Consummatory Anhedonia and Parental Daily-Life Socialization Behaviors*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *b* | SE (*b*) | *p* | Cohen’s *d* |
| Parental Anticipatory Anhedonia 🡪 Child-Report Parental Enhancing |
| Intercept | 55.46 | 2.44 | <.001 |  |
| Parental Anticipatory Pleasure | .23 | .34 | .506 | .13 |
| Parental Anticipatory Anhedonia 🡪 Child-Report Parental Dampening |
| Intercept | 9.22 | .88 | <.001 |  |
| Parental Anticipatory Pleasure | -.06 | .13 | .608 | -.10 |
| Parental Anticipatory Anhedonia 🡪 Parent-Report Parental Enhancing |
| Intercept | 65.61 | 1.51 | <.001 |  |
| Parental Anticipatory Pleasure | .80 | .22 | <.001 | .64 |
| Parental Anticipatory Anhedonia 🡪 Parent-Report Parental Dampening |
| Intercept | 8.78 | .78 | <.001 |  |
| Parental Anticipatory Pleasure | -.07 | .11 | .520 | -.11 |
| Parental Consummatory Anhedonia 🡪 Child-Report Parental Enhancing |
| Intercept | 55.37 | 2.44 | <.001 |  |
| Parental Consummatory Pleasure | -.45 | .42 | .280 | -.21 |
| Parental Consummatory Anhedonia 🡪 Child Report Parental Dampening |
| Intercept | 9.20 | .88 | <.001 |  |
| Parental Consummatory Pleasure | -.10 | .15 | .505 | -.13 |
| Parental Consummatory Anhedonia 🡪 Parent-Report Parental Enhancing |
| Intercept | 65.83 | 1.57 | <.001 |  |
| Parental Consummatory Pleasure | .56 | .27 | .039 | .36 |
| Parental Consummatory Anhedonia 🡪 Parent-Report Parental Dampening |
| Intercept | 8.76 | .77 | <.001 |  |
| Parental Consummatory Pleasure | -.23 | .13 | .082 | -.30 |

*Note. b*=unstandardized effect size; SE=standard error of the unstandardized effect size.

**Table S4**

*Fit Statistics for Conditional Growth Curve Multilevel Structural Equation Models Evaluating Associations between Parental Daily-Life Responses to Positive Affect and Youth Growth Trajectories (i.e., Intercepts and Slopes)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | CFI | RMSEA  | SRMR(w) | SRMR(b) | AIC | BIC | χ2 (df) | p |
| **Associations Using Child-Reported Parental Responses to Positive Affect** |
| Enhancing 🡪 Growth Depressive Symptoms | .99 | .01 | <.001 | .05 | 14366.77 | 14453.78 | 87.80 (78) | .210 |
| Dampening 🡪 Growth Depressive Symptoms | .99 | .01 | .002 | .05 | 13223.54 | 13310.56 | 87.15 (78) | .224 |
| Enhancing 🡪 Growth Positive Affect | .95 | .01 | <.001 | .07 | 15520.51 | 15607.53 | 135.52 (78) | <.001 |
| Dampening 🡪 Growth Positive Affect | .96 | .01 | .003 | .07 | 14375.32 | 14462.33 | 129.12 (78) | <.001 |
| Enhancing 🡪 Growth Negative Affect | .95 | .01 | .002 | .06 | 14279.47 | 14366.49 | 122.82 (78) | <.001 |
| Dampening 🡪 Growth Negative Affect | .94 | .01 | .002 | .06 | 13132.06 | 13219.07 | 123.62 (78) | <.001 |
| **Associations Using Parent-Reported Parental Responses to Positive Affect** |
| Enhancing 🡪 Growth Depressive Symptoms | .99 | .01 | .001 | .05 | 18098.16 | 18186.56 | 91.03 (78) | .149 |
| Dampening 🡪 Growth Depressive Symptoms | .98 | .01 | <.001 | .05 | 16462.77 | 16551.17 | 93.60 (78) | .110 |
| Enhancing 🡪 Growth Positive Affect | .95 | .01 | .002 | .07 | 19269.49 | 19357.89 | 131.75 (78) | <.001 |
| Dampening 🡪 Growth Positive Affect | .95 | .01 | .001 | .07 | 17629.75 | 17718.15 | 138.78 (78) | <.001 |
| Enhancing 🡪 Growth Negative Affect | .95 | .01 | .003 | .05 | 17985.13 | 18073.53 | 122.23 (78) | .001 |
| Dampening 🡪 Growth Negative Affect | .94 | .01 | <.001 | .06 | 16345.35 | 16433.75 | 127.93 (78) | <.001 |

*Note.* CFI=comparative fit index; RMSEA=root mean square error of approximation; 95% CI=95% confidence interval; SRMR(w)=standardized root mean square residual for within component of model; SRMR(b)=standardized root mean square residual for between component of model; AIC=akaike information criterion; BIC=sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criterion; df=degrees of freedom.

**Table S5**

*Fit Statistics for Multilevel Structural Equation Models Evaluating Associations between Youth Growth Trajectories (i.e., Intercepts and Slopes) and Prospective Parental Responses to Positive Affect*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | CFI | RMSEA  | SRMR(w) | SRMR(b) | AIC | BIC | χ2 (df) | p |
| **Associations Using Child-Reported Parental Responses to Positive Affect** |
| Growth positive affect 🡪 Parental enhancing | .95 | .02 | .01 | .08 | 8940.14 | 9003.15 | 136.60 (78) | <.001 |
| Growth negative affect 🡪 Parental enhancing | .92 | .02 | .004 | .07 | 7918.30 | 7981.30 | 138.20 (78) | <.001 |
| Growth depressive symptoms 🡪 Parental enhancing | .99 | .01 | .007 | .07 | 7932.17 | 7995.17 | 87.45 (78) | .217 |
| Growth positive affect 🡪 Parental dampening | .95 | .02 | .02 | .09 | 8755.81 | 8818.81 | 137.42 (78) | <.001 |
| Growth negative affect 🡪 Parental dampening | .93 | .02 | .01 | .07 | 7726.72 | 7787.39 | 131.63 (79)a | <.001 |
| Growth depressive symptoms 🡪 Parental dampening | .99 | .01 | .01 | .05 | 7740.44 | 7803.44 | 84.61 (78) | .285 |
| **Associations Using Parent-Reported Parental Responses to Positive Affect** |
| Growth positive affect 🡪 Parental enhancing | .96 | .01 | .001 | .07 | 14465.49 | 14551.21 | 121.65 (78) | .001 |
| Growth negative affect 🡪 Parental enhancing | .93 | .01 | .001 | .06 | 13267.14 | 13352.86 | 127.93 (78) | <.001 |
| Growth depressive symptoms 🡪 Parental enhancing | .995 | .003 | .001 | .05 | 13363.90 | 13449.62 | 81.76 (78) | .363 |
| Growth positive affect 🡪 Parental dampening | .95 | .01 | .01 | .07 | 13422.27 | 13508.00 | 137.04 (78) | <.001 |
| Growth negative affect 🡪 Parental dampening | .95 | .01 | .01 | .06 | 12222.80 | 12305.35 | 116.67 (79)a | .004 |
| Growth depressive symptoms 🡪 Parental dampening | 1.00 | <.001 | .003 | .05 | 12321.43 | 12407.16 | 76.44 (78) | .529 |

*Note.* CFI=comparative fit index; RMSEA=root mean square error of approximation; 95% CI=95% confidence interval; SRMR(w)=standardized root mean square residual for within component of model; SRMR(b)=standardized root mean square residual for between component of model; AIC=akaike information criterion; BIC=sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criterion; df=degrees of freedom. aParameter corresponding to regression of the parental dampening on the quadratic slope of youth negative affect trajectories was constrained to zero due to issues with model convergence, resulting in one additional degree of freedom.

**Table S6**

*Fit Statistics for Structural Equation Models Evaluating Prospective Associations between Youth Growth Trajectories (i.e., Intercepts and Slopes) and Parental Symptoms*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model  | CFI | RMSEA [95% CI] | SRMR | AIC | BIC | χ2 (df) | *p* |
| Growth positive affect 🡪 Parental depressive symptoms | .95 | .07 [.05, .09] | .07 | 9324.47 | 9318.66 | 149.96 (90) | <.001 |
| Growth negative affect 🡪 Parental depressive symptoms | .94 | .06 [.04, .08] | .06 | 8123.25 | 8117.44 | 142.64 (90) | <.001 |
| Growth depressive symptoms 🡪 Parental depressive symptoms | .98 | .04 [.00, .06] | .05 | 8253.06 | 8247.25 | 107.52 (90) | .101 |
| Growth positive affect 🡪 Parental trait anhedonia | .94 | .07 [.05, .09] | .08 | 9336.17 | 9330.36 | 158.26 (90) | <.001 |
| Growth negative affect 🡪 Parental trait anhedonia | .96 | .05 [.03, .07] | .06 | 8146.77 | 8140.96 | 125.98 (90) | .007 |
| Growth depressive symptoms 🡪 Parental trait anhedonia | .97 | .05 [.02, .07] | .06 | 8272.76 | 8267.17 | 118.22 (91)a | .029 |

*Note.* CFI=comparative fit index; RMSEA=root mean square error of approximation; 95% CI=95% confidence interval; SRMR=standardized root mean square residual; (AIC=akaike information criterion; BIC=sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criterion; df=degrees of freedom. aParameter corresponding to regression of the parental trait anhedonia on the quadratic slope of youth depressive symptoms trajectories was constrained to zero due to issues with model convergence, resulting in one additional degree of freedom.

**Table S7**

*Results of Multilevel Models Evaluating Associations between Youth Growth Trajectories (i.e., Intercepts and Slopes) and Parental Trait Anticipatory and Consummatory Anhedonia*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | β | b  | SE | P |
| **DV: Parental Anticipatory Anhedonia at 12mo** |
| Positive Affect (PA) |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept PA | -.01 | -.02 | .08 | .822 |
| Linear Slope PA | .30 | 2.36 | 1.84 | .198 |
| Quad Slope PA | .21 | 20.39 | 18.37 | .267 |
| Ant Pleasure BSL | .81 | .82 | .06 | <.001 |
| Negative Affect (NA) |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept NA | -.08 | -.20 | .15 | .184 |
| Linear Slope NA | -.62 | -7.63 | 8.36 | .361 |
| Quad Slope NA | -.59 | -98.73 | 125.22 | .430 |
| Ant Pleasure BSL | .81 | .82 | .05 | <.001 |
| Depressive Symptoms (Dep) |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept Dep | -.01 | -.02 | .11 | .867 |
| Linear Slope Dep | -.01 | -.13 | .66 | .851 |
| Quad Slope Dep | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ant Pleasure BSL | .81 | .82 | .06 | <.001 |
| **DV: Parental Consummatory Anhedonia at 12mo** |
| Positive Affect (PA) |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept PA | -.004 | -.01 | .08 | .939 |
| Linear Slope PA | .25 | 1.77 | 1.60 | .268 |
| Quad Slope PA | .10 | 9.04 | 16.21 | .577 |
| Con Pleasure BSL | .79 | .83 | .06 | <.001 |
| Negative Affect (NA) |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept NA | -.01 | -.03 | .11 | .786 |
| Linear Slope NA | -.003 | -.04 | .91 | .967 |
| Quad Slope NA | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Con Pleasure BSL | .79 | .83 | .06 | <.001 |
| Depressive Symptoms (Dep) |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept Dep | .02 | .04 | .10 | .705 |
| Linear Slope Dep | .01 | .09 | .70 | .897 |
| Quad Slope Dep | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Con Pleasure BSL | .79 | .83 | .06 | <.001 |

Note. Due to issues with model convergence, parameter corresponding to the regression of parental consummatory anhedonia on the quadratic slope of youth negative affect trajectory was fixed to zero. With this constraint applied, the model converged successfully with fit indices indicating adequate model fit (CFI=.95, RMSEA=.06, SRMR=.07). As in primary study analyses, the parameters corresponding to regressions of parental anticipatory and consummatory anhedonia on the quadratic slope characterizing youth depressive symptom trajectories were also fixed to zero. β=standardized effect size; b=unstandardized effect size; SE=standard error of the unstandardized effect size; ant=anticipatory; con=consummatory.

**Table S8**

*Summary of Results Associated with Aim 1: Associations between Parental Mood and Parental Responses to Adolescent Positive Affect*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Parental Depressive Symptoms | Parental Trait Anhedonia |
| Child-Reported Enhancing | ns | ns |
| Child-Reported Dampening | ns | ns |
| Parent-Reported Enhancing | ns | - |
| Parent-Reported Dampening | ns | ns |

*Note.* For ease of interpretation, cells are color-coded according to the strength and direction of observed effects. Specifically, red is used to indicate negative associations and grey is used to indicate non-significant associations. ns=non-significant.

**Table S9**

*Summary of Results Associated with Aim 2: Associations between Parental Responses to Youth Positive Affect and Youth Developmental Trajectories*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Child-Reported Enhancing | Child-Reported Dampening | Parent-Reported Enhancing | Parent-Reported Dampening |
| *Depressive Symptoms* |
| Intercept  | - | + | ns | ns |
| Linear Slope  | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Quadratic Slope  | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| *Positive Affect* |
| Intercept  | + | - | ns | ns |
| Linear Slope  | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Quadratic Slope  | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| *Negative Affect* |
| Intercept  | ns | + | ns | ns |
| Linear Slope  | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Quadratic Slope  | ns | ns | ns | ns |

*Note.* For ease of interpretation, cells are color-coded according to the strength and direction of observed effects. Specifically, green is used to indicate positive associations, red is used to indicate negative associations, and grey is used to indicate non-significant associations. ns=non-significant.

**Table S10**

*Summary of Results Associated with Aim 3: Associations between Youth Developmental Trajectories and Parental Responses to Youth Positive Affect and Parental Mood*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intercept Positive Affect | Linear Slope Positive Affect | Quadratic Slope Positive Affect |
| Child-Reported Enhancing | + | - | - |
| Child-Reported Dampening | ns | ns | ns |
| Parent-Reported Enhancing | ns | ns | ns |
| Parent-Reported Dampening | ns | ns | ns |
| Parental Depressive Symptoms  | ns | - | - |
| Parental Trait Anhedonia  | ns | ns | ns |
|  | Intercept Negative Affect | Linear Slope Negative Affect | Quadratic Slope Negative Affect |
| Child-Reported Enhancing | ns | ns | ns |
| Child-Reported Dampening | + | + | \*\*\* |
| Parent-Reported Enhancing | ns | ns | ns |
| Parent-Reported Dampening | ns | ns | \*\*\* |
| Parental Depressive Symptoms  | ns | ns | ns |
| Parental Trait Anhedonia  | ns | ns | ns |
|  | Intercept Depressive Symptoms | Linear Slope Depressive Symptoms | Quadratic Slope Depressive Symptoms |
| Child-Reported Enhancing | - | + | + |
| Child-Reported Dampening | + | ns | ns |
| Parent-Reported Enhancing | ns | ns | ns |
| Parent-Reported Dampening | ns | ns | ns |
| Parental Depressive Symptoms  | ns | + | + |
| Parental Trait Anhedonia  | ns | ns | ns |

*Note.* For ease of interpretation, cells are color-coded according to the strength and direction of observed effects. Specifically, green is used to indicate positive associations, red is used to indicate negative associations, and grey is used to indicate non-significant associations. ns=non-significant; \*\*\* indicates that the parameter was fixed to zero due to concerns related to model convergence.

*Figure S1.* Projected trajectories and observed means for youth depressive symptoms based on monthly self-report questionnaire data. M=month.

*Figure S2.* Projected trajectories and observed means for youth positive affect based on monthly self-report questionnaire data. M=month.

*Figure S3.* Projected trajectories and observed means for youth negative affect based on monthly self-report questionnaire data. M=month.