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# Published studies using the same datasets.

Removed for masked review

# B. Additional tables

## Table S1. Participant demographics in Studies 1 and 2.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Study 2 | Study 1 |  |
| Women | Men | Women | Men |
| M (SD) | M (SD) | M (SD) | M (SD) |
| 26.7 (3.9) | 29.2 (4.3) | 39.7 (8.04) | 41.0 (9.2) | Age |
| 68.8% | 35.8% | % Married |
| 15.0 (2.1) | 14.8 (2.5) | 15.0 (8.0) | 14.3 (2.0) | Education (years) |
| Mean (SD) = 4.6 (2.9)Range = 1-17 | Mean (SD) = 4.4 (3.4)Range = 1-18 | Relationship duration (years) |
| Mean(SD) = 3.1 (2.5)Range = 0.5-15 | Mean (SD) = 2.7 (3.0)Range = 1-16 | Cohabitation duration (years) |

## Table S2. Fixed Effects of the Unmoderated Models Predicting Relationship Outcomes.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fixed effectsa | Study 1 | Study 2 |
|  | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) |
|  | Negative Relationship Feelings |
| Intercept  | 0.25 (0.04) | [0.17, 0.34] | 5.84 (42.5) | 0.27 (0.03) | [0.2, 0.33] | 8.38 (78.6) |
| MES | 0.07 (0.04) | [-0.02, 0.16] | 1.56 (34.9) | 0.07 (0.03) | [0.01, 0.13] | 2.49 (78.5) |
| Lagged Negative RFs | -0.26 (0.04) | [-0.34, -0.19] | -6.92 (29.8) | -0.32 (0.02) | [-0.36, -0.28] | -15.45 (78.8) |
|  | Positive Relationship Feelings |
| Intercept  | 2.73 (0.11) | [2.51, 2.94] | 25.51 (42.8) | 2.75 (0.06) | [2.63, 2.87] | 45.97 (78.9) |
| MES | -0.03 (0.06) | [-0.15, 0.08] | -0.54 (36) | -0.02 (0.03) | [-0.08, 0.04] | -0.68 (77.9) |
| Lagged Positive RFs | -0.34 (0.03) | [-0.39, -0.28] | -11.44(45.2) | -0.32 (0.02) | [-0.35, 0.00] | -20.99 (79.5) |
|  | Perceived Partner Responsiveness |
| Intercept  |  |  |  | 5.08 (0.08) | [4.91, 5.25] | 59.81 (78.9) |
| MES |  |  |  | -0.08 (0.04) | [-0.16, 0.00] | -1.91 (75.1) |
| Lagged PPR |  |  |  | -0.32 (0.02) | [-0.35, -0.28] | -18.08 (63.2) |

*Note*. MES= Momentary Emotional Similarity.
a Confidence intervals (CI) for fixed effects were based on two-tailed t tests with the Satterthwaite approximation method for computing degrees of freedom.

## Table S3. Fixed Effects of the Unmoderated Models Predicting Momentary Emotional Similarity by Conflict and Sex.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fixed effectsa | Study 1 | Study 2 |
|  | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) |
| Intercept | 0.33 (0.06) | [0.22, 0.45] | 6.03 (43.1) | 0.21 (0.03) | [0.14, 0.28] | 6.35 (76.3) |
| Conflict | 0.01 (0.05) | [-0.09, 0.10] | 0.18 (33.1) | 0.00 (0.04) | [-0.07, 0.08] | 0.03 (74.6) |
| Sex | 0.04 (0.05) | [-0.06, 0.14] | 0.76 (31.3) | 0.05 (0.03) | [-0.01, 0.10] | 1.79 (73.1) |

a Confidence intervals (CI) for fixed effects were based on two-tailed t tests with the Satterthwaite approximation method for computing degrees of freedom.

## Table R1. Bivariate correlations among all day-level person mean-centered variables including an emotional intensity index.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1. Positive moods |  | -0.58\*\*\* | 0.76\*\*\* | 0.05\*\*\* | 0.55\*\*\* | -0.38\*\*\* | 0.38\*\*\* |
| 2. Negative moods | -0.55\*\*\* |  | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.03\*\* | -0.42\*\*\* | 0.58\*\*\* | -0.34\*\*\* |
| 3. Emotional intensity  | 0.61\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* |  | 0.09\*\*\* | 0.35\*\*\* | -0.01 | 0.19\*\*\* |
| 4. Emotional similarity | 0.06\*\* | -0.01 | 0.08\*\*\* |  | 0.03\*\* | 0.05\*\*\* | -0.02 |
| 5. Positive RFs | 0.60\*\*\* | -0.39\*\*\* | 0.34\*\*\* | -0.01 |  | -0.55\*\*\* | 0.62\*\*\* |
| 6. Negative RFs | -0.32\*\*\* | 0.62\*\*\* | 0.12\*\*\* | 0.05\* | -0.48\*\*\* |  | -0.4\*\*\* |
| 7. PPR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Study 1 Mean* | 2.08 | 0.42 | 2.50 | 0.36 | 2.74 | 0.27 |  |
| *Study 1 SD* | 0.87 | 0.59 | 0.77 | 0.33 | 0.78 | 0.36 |  |
| *Study 2 Mean* | 2.21 | 0.34 | 2.55 | 0.23 | 2.76 | 0.27 | 5.08 |
| *Study 2 SD* | 0.82 | 0.51 | 0.70 | 0.27 | 0.65 | 0.33 | 0.88 |

*Note.* Study 1 correlations are below the diagonal; Study 2 correlations are above the diagonal

 *\*p<*.05. \*\**p<*.01. \*\*\**p<*.001.

## Table R2. Fixed Effects of the Models Predicting Negative Relationship Feelings Moderated by Conflict and Sex (including emotional intensity).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fixed effectsa | Study 1 | Study 2 |
|  | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) |
| Intercept  | 0.21 (0.04) | [0.13, 0.29] | 5.43 (43.5) | 0.2 (0.02) | [0.15, 0.24] | 8.66 (72.5) |
| Conflict | 0.19 (0.03) | [0.13, 0.26] | 5.8 (34.9) | 0.25 (0.03) | [0.19, 0.31] | 8.64 (74.9) |
| Sex  | -0.04 (0.02) | [-0.07, 0.00] | -2.07 (593) | -0.03 (0.01) | [-0.06, 0.00] | -2.35 (63.5) |
| Day-Level MES | 0.02 (0.04) | [-0.06, 0.10] | 0.5 (58.4) | 0.02 (0.02) | [-0.02, 0.05] | 1.04 (94.7) |
| Day-Level Emotional Intensity | 0.01 (0.00) | [0.00, 0.01] | 2.5 (63.3) | -0.04 (0.02) | [-0.08, 0.00] | -1.90 (108) |
| Conflict\* Day-Level MES  | 0.15 (0.04) | [0.07, 0.22] | 3.71 (597) | 0.17 (0.06) | [0.06, 0.29] | 2.98 (73.4) |
| Sex\* Day-Level MES | -0.05 (0.04) | [-0.12, 0.02] | -1.43 (628) | -0.09 (0.02) | [-0.14, -0.05] | -3.98 (2102) |
| Conflict\* Day-Level Emotional Intensity | 0.00 (0.00) | [-0.01, 0.00] | -1.97 (626) | -0.02 (0.07) | [-0.15, 0.11] | -0.33 (72.7) |
| Sex\* Day-Level Emotional Intensity | 0.00 (0.00) | [-0.01, 0.00] | -2.48 (604) | 0.03 (0.03) | [-0.03, 0.09] | 0.96 (1791) |
| Couple Level MES | -0.07 (0.12) | [-0.31, 0.16] | -0.63 (42) | -0.03 (0.09) | [-0.20, 0.14] | -0.39 (74.2) |
| Conflict\* Couple Level MES | -0.04 (0.10) | [-0.25, 0.16] | -0.43 (38.2) | 0.18 (0.11) | [-0.04, 0.40] | 1.61 (77.2) |
| Sex\* Couple Level MES | 0.01 (0.06) | [-0.10, 0.13] | 0.23 (601) | -0.02 (0.05) | [-0.12, 0.09] | -0.31 (67.4) |
| Lagged Negative RF | -0.23 (0.03) | [-0.30, -0.17] | -7.35 (30.5) | -0.24 (0.02) | [-0.28, -0.2] | -11.28 (76.9) |

MES=Momentary Emotional Similarity; RF=Relationship Feelings.

a Confidence intervals (CI) for fixed effects were based on two-tailed t tests with the Satterthwaite approximation method for computing degrees of freedom.

## Table R3. Fixed Effects of the Models Predicting Positive Relationship Feelings Moderated by Conflict and Sex (including emotional intensity).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fixed effectsa | Study 1 | Study 2 |
|  | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) |
| Intercept  | 2.76 (0.10) | [2.57, 2.96] | 28.66 (43.2) | 2.81 (0.05) | [2.70, 2.92] | 51.05 (78.2) |
| Conflict | -0.25 (0.03) | [-0.32, -0.18] | -7.22 (28.2) | -0.27 (0.03) | [-0.33, -0.21] | -9.56 (67.6) |
| Sex  | 0.09 (0.03) | [0.04, 0.14] | 3.44 (613) | 0.09 (0.02) | [0.06, 0.12] | 5.39 (75.8) |
| Day-Level MES | 0.00 (0.05) | [-0.11, 0.11] | 0.02 (60.5) | 0.02 (0.02) | [-0.02, 0.05] | 0.84 (97.8) |
| Day-Level Emotional Intensity | 0.01 (0.00) | [0.01, 0.02] | 4.35 (70.4) | 0.36 (0.03) | [0.29, 0.43] | 10.56 (105) |
| Conflict\* Day-Level MES  | -0.16 (0.06) | [-0.27, -0.05] | -2.92 (604) | -0.21 (0.05) | [-0.31, -0.1] | -3.99 (79.2) |
| Sex\* Day-Level MES | 0.05 (0.05) | [-0.05, 0.16] | 1.06 (640) | 0.07 (0.03) | [0.01, 0.13] | 2.35 (1930) |
| Conflict\* Day-Level Emotional Intensity | 0.00 (0.00) | [0.00, 0.01] | 1.04 (622) | -0.04 (0.06) | [-0.16, 0.09] | -0.60 (67.2) |
| Sex\* Day-Level Emotional Intensity | 0.00 (0.00) | [0.00, 0.01] | 1.39 (604) | 0.02 (0.04) | [-0.06, 0.10] | 0.41 (2367) |
| Couple Level MES | 0.68 (0.29) | [0.09, 1.27] | 2.31 (42.6) | 0.54 (0.21) | [0.13, 0.95] | 2.63 (78.9) |
| Conflict\* Couple Level MES | 0.10 (0.11) | [-0.12, 0.33] | 0.94 (35.7) | -0.25 (0.11) | [-0.46, -0.03] | -2.26 (72) |
| Sex\* Couple Level MES | 0.05 (0.08) | [-0.11, 0.22] | 0.66 (619) | -0.01 (0.06) | [-0.13, 0.12] | -0.08 (85.2) |
| Lagged Positive RF | -0.27 (0.03) | [-0.32, -0.21] | -9.91 (35.5) | -0.26 (0.01) | [-0.29, -0.23] | -18.58 (78) |

MES=Momentary Emotional Similarity; RF=Relationship Feelings.

a Confidence intervals (CI) for fixed effects were based on two-tailed t tests with the Satterthwaite approximation method for computing degrees of freedom.

## Table R4. Fixed Effects of the Models Predicting Perceived Partner Responsiveness Moderated by Conflict and Sex (including emotional intensity).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fixed effectsa | Study 2 |
|  | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) |
| Intercept  | 5.16 (0.08) | [5.01, 5.31] | 68.08 (77.5) |
| Conflict | -0.34 (0.04) | [-0.42, -0.25] | -7.97 (68.6) |
| Sex  | 0.07 (0.03) | [0.02, 0.12] | 2.73 (59.1) |
| Day-Level MES | -0.02 (0.02) | [-0.07, 0.02] | -1.01 (73.2) |
| Day-Level Emotional Intensity | 0.25 (0.04) | [0.17, 0.32] | 6.20 (127) |
| Conflict\* Day-Level MES  | -0.26 (0.08) | [-0.42, -0.10] | -3.24 (78.5) |
| Sex\* Day-Level MES | 0.11 (0.04) | [0.03, 0.19] | 2.74 (1654) |
| Conflict\* Day-Level Emotional Intensity | -0.08 (0.10) | [-0.27, 0.12] | -0.81 (74.8) |
| Sex\* Day-Level Emotional Intensity | -0.06 (0.06) | [-0.17, 0.05] | -1.15 (2194) |
| Couple Level MES | 0.32 (0.28) | [-0.25, 0.89] | 1.13 (78.1) |
| Conflict\* Couple Level MES | -0.23 (0.16) | [-0.56, 0.09] | -1.41 (72) |
| Sex\* Couple Level MES | -0.10 (0.10) | [-0.30, 0.09] | -1.04 (61.8) |
| Lagged Perceived Partner Responsiveness | -0.24 (0.02) | [-0.28, -0.21] | -14.94 (65.8) |

MES=Momentary Emotional Similarity; RF=Relationship Feelings.

a Confidence intervals (CI) for fixed effects were based on two-tailed t tests with the Satterthwaite approximation method for computing degrees of freedom.

## C. Rationale for assessing daily mood and relationship feelings as momentary states

Our interest in this paper and in most work over the last decade and a half (e.g., Rafaeli & Revelle, 2006; Rafaeli et al., 2007, Coifman et al., 2012; Zaki et al., 2013; Snir et al., 2016) has been in momentary affect. True, we could have asked participants to note “how you are feeling today”, but our understanding of affective states as dynamic phenomena make us doubt the degree to which answers to such questions reflect true subjective experience vs. schematic processing of oneself and one’s world. As Robinson and Clore (2002) noted, responses that rely on experiential detail may not entirely agree with ones that tap into semantic or even episodic knowledge about the triggering event.

# **D. Results of the fuller models described in footnote 3.**

In these models, couple-level MES was included as a moderator of the effects of *day-level MES* and of the two level-1 interaction terms (namely, *conflict by day-level MES* and *sex by day-level MES*).

**Predicting negative RF**: As can be seen in Table R5, couple-level MES did not significantly moderate day level MES’s effect or its interactions with either sex or conflict (though some trend-level effects did emerge).

**Predicting positive RF**: As can be seen in Table R6 and Figures R1 and R2, couple-level MES significantly moderated day-level MES’s interaction with conflict (only in Study 2) and with sex (in both studies, though for Study 1 this three-way interaction was only marginal). Probing the significant interactions, we found that for couples marked by high MES, conflict’s effect was strong on days with either low daily MES (*b*=-0.31, *SE[b]*=0.05, *t*=-6.64, *p*<.001) or high daily MES (*b*=-0.39, *SE[b]*=0.06, *t*=-6.23, *p*<0.001), with no effect for the type of day (*b*=-0.08, *SE[b]*=0.07, *t*=-1.13, *p*=0.261). In contrast, for couples marked by low MES, conflict’s effect was significantly smaller (*b*=-0.36, *SE[b]*=0.07, *t*=-5.02, *p*<.001) on low MES days (*b*=-0.01, *SE[b]*=0.05, *t*=-0.27, *p*=.788) than on high MES days (*b*=-0.37, *SE[b]*=0.06, *t*=-6.16, *p*<.001).

Additionally, we found that for couples marked by high MES, sex effect was significant on days with either low daily MES (*b*=0.09, *SE[b]*=0.03, *t*=2.66, *p*=0.009) or high daily MES (*b*=0.13, *SE[b]*=0.04, *t*=3.61, *p*<0.001), with no effect for the type of day (*b*=0.04, *SE[b]*=0.04, *t*=0.87, *p*=0.386). In contrast, for couples marked by low MES, conflict’s effect was significantly smaller (*b*=0.19, *SE[b]*=0.05, *t*=3.93, *p*<.001) on low MES days (*b*=0.02, *SE[b]*=0.04, *t*=0.57, *p*=.569) than on high MES days (*b*=0.21, *SE[b]*=0.04, *t*=5.73, *p*<.001).

Lastly, couple-level MES itself also became a significant predictor of positive RF in Study 2 (where in the original analysis it only approached significance).

**Predicting PPR.** As can be seen in Table R7 and Figures R3, couple-level MES significantly moderated day-level MES’s interaction with conflict. Probing the significant interaction, we found that for couples marked by high MES, conflict’s effect was strong on days with either low daily MES (*b*=-0.34, *SE[b]*=0.06, *t*=-5.57, *p*<.001) or high daily MES (*b*=-0.39, *SE[b]*=0.09, *t*=-4.23, *p*<0.001), with no effect for the type of day (*b*=-0.05, *SE[b]*=0.10, *t*=-0.49, *p*=0.624). In contrast, for couples marked by low MES, conflict’s effect was significantly smaller (*b*=-0.39, *SE[b]*=0.10, *t*=-3.90 *p*<.001) on low MES days (*b*=-0.06, *SE[b]*=0.06, *t*=-0.88, *p*=.381) than on high MES days (*b*=-0.45, *SE[b]*=0.09, *t*=-4.99, *p*<.001).

**Brief summary.**

In summary, it appears that the amplifying role of day-level MES (which was present as an average effect in all models) is most relevant to couples with low-to-moderate levels of couple-level MES; those couples marked by habitual higher levels of MES appear to have strong effects of both conflict (on positive RFs and PPR) and of sex (on positive RF) whether the day is high or low in MES relative to their (habitually high) average.

Table R5. Fixed Effects from Fuller Model Predicting Negative Relationship Feelings (see Footnote 3).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fixed effectsa | Study 1 | Study 2 |
|  | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) |
| Intercept  | 0.2 (0.04) | [0.13, 0.27] | 5.37 (46.5) | 0.2 (0.02) | [0.15, 0.25] | 8.45 (70.6) |
| Conflict | 0.21 (0.03) | [0.15, 0.28] | 6.58 (37.8) | 0.25 (0.03) | [0.19, 0.3] | 9.48 (70.5) |
| Sex  | -0.05 (0.02) | [-0.09, -0.01] | -2.73 (262) | -0.04 (0.02) | [-0.07, -0.01] | -2.67 (66.8) |
| Day-Level MES | -0.02 (0.04) | [-0.1, 0.06] | -0.44 (57) | 0.02 (0.02) | [-0.01, 0.05] | 1.2 (91.2) |
| Conflict \* Day-Level MES  | 0.21 (0.04) | [0.13, 0.3] | 5.09 (534) | 0.17 (0.05) | [0.06, 0.27] | 3.22 (63.7) |
| Sex \* Day-Level MES | -0.01 (0.04) | [-0.09, 0.06] | -0.38 (587) | -0.11 (0.02) | [-0.16, -0.07] | -4.77 (1843) |
| Couple Level MES | -0.08 (0.11) | [-0.3, 0.14] | -0.71 (45.8) | -0.02 (0.09) | [-0.19, 0.16] | -0.19 (72.9) |
| Conflict \* Couple Level MES | -0.04 (0.1) | [-0.25, 0.16] | -0.43 (44.6) | 0.21 (0.1) | [0.01, 0.4] | 2.09 (74.7) |
| Sex \* Couple Level MES | 0.03 (0.06) | [-0.08, 0.15] | 0.58 (187) | -0.03 (0.06) | [-0.15, 0.08] | -0.56 (72.7) |
| Day-Level MES \* Couple Level MES | 0.21 (0.11) | [-0.02, 0.44] | 1.83 (41.1) | -0.09 (0.06) | [-0.21, 0.03] | -1.52 (102) |
| Conflict\*Day-Level MES\*Couple Level MES | -0.19 (0.1) | [-0.4, 0.01] | -1.89 (633) | -0.34 (0.19) | [-0.72, 0.04] | -1.79 (61) |
| Sex\*Day-Level MES\*Couple Level MES | -0.07 (0.1) | [-0.27, 0.13] | -0.68 (505) | 0.15 (0.09) | [-0.02, 0.32] | 1.74 (1627) |
| Lagged Negative RF | -0.24 (0.03) | [-0.31, -0.17] | -7.34 (26) | -0.26 (0.02) | [-0.3, -0.22] | -12.04 (78.5) |

MES=Momentary Emotional Similarity; RF=Relationship Feelings.

aConfidence intervals (CI) for fixed effects were based on two-tailed t tests with the Satterthwaite approximation method for computing degrees of freedom.

Table R6. Fixed Effects from Fuller Model Predicting Positive Relationship Feelings (see Footnote 3).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fixed effectsa | Study 1 | Study 2 |
|  | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) |
| Intercept  | 2.77 (0.1) | [2.56, 2.97] | 27.43 (38.6) | 2.8 (0.05) | [2.69, 2.91] | 51.37 (77.3) |
| Conflict | -0.29 (0.04) | [-0.38, -0.2] | -6.58 (28.8) | -0.27 (0.03) | [-0.33, -0.21] | -9.22 (61.3) |
| Sex  | 0.11 (0.03) | [0.06, 0.17] | 4.05 (384) | 0.11 (0.02) | [0.07, 0.15] | 5.78 (65.4) |
| Day-Level MES | -0.05 (0.06) | [-0.17, 0.07] | -0.85 (53.5) | 0.02 (0.02) | [-0.02, 0.07] | 1.12 (77.9) |
| Conflict \* Day-Level MES  | -0.1 (0.06) | [-0.22, 0.02] | -1.64 (455) | -0.22 (0.05) | [-0.32, -0.12] | -4.34 (68) |
| Sex \* Day-Level MES | 0.15 (0.05) | [0.04, 0.26] | 2.78 (564) | 0.11 (0.03) | [0.05, 0.17] | 3.51 (2030) |
| Couple Level MES | 0.66 (0.31) | [0.04, 1.28] | 2.15 (38.2) | 0.56 (0.2) | [0.15, 0.96] | 2.73 (78.2) |
| Conflict \* Couple Level MES | 0.19 (0.14) | [-0.09, 0.47] | 1.37 (34.9) | -0.29 (0.11) | [-0.51, -0.07] | -2.6 (68.1) |
| Sex \* Couple Level MES | 0.09 (0.09) | [-0.09, 0.26] | 1.01 (186) | -0.01 (0.07) | [-0.15, 0.14] | -0.1 (73.9) |
| Day-Level MES \* Couple Level MES | 0.06 (0.16) | [-0.27, 0.38] | 0.35 (38.4) | 0.08 (0.08) | [-0.09, 0.24] | 0.9 (84.1) |
| Conflict\*Day-Level MES\*Couple Level MES | 0.05 (0.15) | [-0.24, 0.34] | 0.33 (593) | 0.52 (0.18) | [0.16, 0.88] | 2.86 (62.4) |
| Sex\*Day-Level MES\*Couple Level MES | -0.3 (0.15) | [-0.6, 0.01] | -1.93 (520) | -0.27 (0.12) | [-0.5, -0.04] | -2.35 (2241) |
| Lagged Positive RF | -0.29 (0.03) | [-0.35, -0.23] | -10.06(36.9) | -0.3 (0.02) | [-0.33, -0.27] | -19.57 (77) |

*Note.* MES*=*Momentary Emotional Similarity; RF=Relationship Feelings.

aConfidence intervals (CI) for fixed effects were based on two-tailed t tests with the Satterthwaite approximation method for computing degrees of freedom.

Table R7. Fixed Effects from Fuller Model Predicting Perceived Partner Responsiveness (see Footnote 3).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fixed effectsa | Study 2 |
|  | Estimate (*SE*) | 95% CI | *t* (*df*) |
| Intercept  | 5.16 (0.08) | [5.01, 5.31] | 68.24 (76.9) |
| Conflict | -0.31 (0.04) | [-0.39, -0.23] | -7.41 (63.5) |
| Sex  | 0.09 (0.03) | [0.04, 0.14] | 3.48 (54.8) |
| Day-Level MES | -0.03 (0.02) | [-0.07, 0.02] | -1.22 (653) |
| Conflict \* Day-Level MES  | -0.22 (0.07) | [-0.36, -0.08] | -3.11 (63.4) |
| Sex \* Day-Level MES | 0.15 (0.04) | [0.08, 0.23] | 3.88 (1559) |
| Couple Level MES | 0.29 (0.28) | [-0.27, 0.84] | 1.03 (78.1) |
| Conflict \* Couple Level MES | -0.21 (0.16) | [-0.53, 0.11] | -1.32 (68.5) |
| Sex \* Couple Level MES | -0.1 (0.1) | [-0.3, 0.1] | -0.99 (60.9) |
| Day-Level MES \* Couple Level MES | -0.01 (0.09) | [-0.18, 0.16] | -0.13 (709) |
| Conflict\*Day-Level MES\*Couple Level MES | 0.63 (0.26) | [0.12, 1.15] | 2.45 (59.4) |
| Sex\*Day-Level MES\*Couple Level MES | -0.09 (0.15) | [-0.39, 0.2] | -0.63 (2105) |
| Lagged PPR | -0.27 (0.02) | [-0.31, -0.24] | -16.75 (59.3) |

Note. MES=Momentary Emotional Similarity; PPR= Perceived Partner Responsiveness.

aConfidence intervals (CI) for fixed effects were based on two-tailed t tests with the Satterthwaite approximation method for computing degrees of freedom.

Figure R1. The (reversed) effects of conflict on positive relationship feelings
under different levels (1 SD above/below the mean) of day-level MES and
couple-level MES.

Figure R2. The effects of sex on positive relationship feelings under
different levels (1 SD above/below the mean) of day-level MES and
couple-level MES.

Figure R3. The (reversed) effects of conflict on Perceived Partner
Responsiveness under different levels (1 SD above/below the mean) of
day-level MES and couple-level MES.