**Supplemental Material**

**Methods**

**Participants**

**Demographics and psychopathological characteristics**

Demographic and clinical characteristics of the three groups are described in Table 1. As expected, a significant difference between the PTSD and TEHC groups was noted for PTSD scores on the CAPS-5, *t*(69)=17.69, p<.001, *Cohen’s d*=6.31. Significant differences were also noted for depression scores on the HAM-D, *F*(2, 98)=131.37, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.73, and for anxiety scores on the HAM-A, *F*(2, 98)=16.91, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.26. Follow-up analyses revealed a higher depression score for the PTSD group compared with both the TEHC group, *t*(69)=11.02, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=2.65, and the HC group, *t*(65)=13.57, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=3.50. This pattern also emerged for the anxiety score, *t*(69)=3.99, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=0.97, and *t*(65)=4.25, p<.001, *Cohen's d*=1.10, respectively. In addition, the TEHC group had higher depression and anxiety scores compared with the HD group, *t*(62)=3.19, p=.002, *Cohen's d*=0.82 and *t*(62)=2.98, *p*=.004, *Cohen's d*=0.77, respectively. Significant differences between groups were also noted for education, *F*(2, 98)=8.81, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.15, with a higher average in the HC group compared with both the PTSD, *t*(65)=4.04, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=0.98, and the TEHC groups, *t*(69)=2.09, *p*=.04, *Cohen's d*=0.55, which also differed, *t*(62)=2.21, *p*=.03, *Cohen's d*=0.49. Finally, no group differences were noted for age, *F*(2, 98)=0.62, *p*=.54, Gender ratio, *χ2*(2)=1.26, *p*=.53, Ethnicity, *χ2*(4)=0.52, *p*=.77, age at trauma, *t*(69)=0.44, *p*=.66, or time that passed since the traumatic event, *t*(69)=1.17, *p*=.24.

**Detailed Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

Inclusion criteria for the PTSD group were: a) primary diagnosis of PTSD; b) CAPS-5 score >25; c) 18-80 years of age; and d) fluency in English. Exclusion criteria were: a) current severe depression indicated by a HAM-D (Hamilton, 1960) score ≥25 (Zimmerman, Martinez, Young, Chelminski, & Dalrymple, 2013). Severe depression was considered exclusionary due to safety concerns of treatment delay; b) suicidal ideation or behavior; c) current or history of psychosis; d) current or past diagnosis of OCD, bipolar disorder, manic episode, tic disorder, or ADHD; e) current or past organic mental disorder, seizure disorder, epilepsy or brain injury; f) diagnosis of probable Alzheimer’s disease, Vascular Dementia or Parkinson’s disease; g) current unstable or untreated medical illness; h) drug or alcohol misuse - severe alcohol/cannabis disorder or any other substance use disorder except nicotine; i) recent psychotropic medication change or initiation within the last 3 months; j) initiation of psychotherapy within the last 3 months; k) Current cognitive impairments as a result of a traumatic brain injury (TBI); and l) eye-tracking calibration difficulties. Of the 37 participants with PTSD included in the study, 20 also met criteria for current MDD or persistent depressive disorder (PDD), eight for generalized anxiety disorder (GAD), two for panic disorder, three for social anxiety disorder (SAD), and two for eating disorders (ED).

Inclusion criteria for the TEHC group were: a) experiencing a Criterion A traumatic event (of an interpersonal nature); b) 18-80 years of age; and c) fluency in English. Exclusion criteria were: a) present or past PTSD diagnosis; b) significant PTSD symptoms indicated by a CAPS-5 score >10; c) depressive symptoms as indicate by a HAM-D score >8; and d) suicidal ideation or behavior. Additional exclusion criteria were criteria c-to-l as detailed above for the PTSD group. None of the TEHC participants had a current psychiatric diagnosis. Four had past MDD, and one had a past ED.

Inclusion criteria for the HC group were: a) 18-80 years of age; and b) fluency in English. Exclusion criteria were: a) current or past history of any DSM-5 psychiatric disorder; b) experience of a traumatic event (of any kind) or events in childhood and/or adulthood adhering to DSM-5 Criterion A for PTSD; c) depressive symptoms as indicate by a HAM-D score >8; and d) suicidal ideation or behavior. Additional exclusion criteria were criteria e-to-l as detailed above for the PTSD group.

We only invited participants that had normal or corrected-to-normal vision, excluding usage of multi-focal eye wear to prevent eye-tracking calibration difficulties.

**Measures**

**Trauma exposure**

Trauma exposure was determined using the Life Events Checklist for DSM-5 (LEC-5; Weathers et al., 2013), an updated version of the original psychometrically-sound LEC (Gray, Litz, Hsu, & Lombardo, 2004). It is a 17-item self-report measure assessing exposure to potentially traumatic events (e.g., physical assault, sexual assault, combat) during one’s life time. For each event participants are required to indicate if they experienced the event personally, witnessed it, learned about it, experienced it as part of their job, were not sure if they experienced it, or felt the event did not apply to them. From the events reported, participants are asked to identify the one event that currently bothers them the most and reference this event when completing the PTSD-related measures.

**Clinician-rated PTSD**

Severity of PTSD symptoms was measured using CAPS-5 (Weathers et al., 2013). The CAPS-5 is a structured interview diagnosing PTSD based on DSM-5 criteria. It has been widely used in research demonstrating excellent reliability, convergent and discriminant validity, diagnostic utility and sensitivity to change (Weathers et al., 2018; Weathers, Keane, & Davidson, 2001). Cronbach’s α in the current sample was .95.

**Clinician-rated Depression**

Clinician-rated depressive symptoms were measured using the HAM-D (Hamilton, 1960), a 17-item measure covering the core symptoms of depression as manifesting over the past week. The HAM-D has been shown to have strong internal consistency and inter-rater and test-retest reliability (Trajkovic et al., 2011). In the current study the HAM-D was administered using the Structured Interview Guide for the Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (SIGH-D; Williams, 1988) shown to have strong psychometric properties in clinical samples (Williams, 1988). Cronbach’s α in the current sample was .90.

**Clinician-rated Anxiety**

Clinician-rated anxiety symptoms were measured using HAM-A (Hamilton, 1959), a 14-item questionnaire measuring anxiety symptoms over the past week. The HAM-A was administered using the Structured Interview Guide for the Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale (SIGH-A; Shear et al., 2001), which has been shown to have higher inter-rater and test-retest reliability compared with the regular format (Shear et al., 2001). Cronbach’s α in the current sample was .93.

**Results**

**Eye-tracking data – Additional analyses**

**Sustained attention (total dwell time) - Session 2, detailed follow-up analyses**

A significant group-by-AOI interaction effect was noted, *F*(2, 92)=15.49, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.25. Comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=19.50, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.245. The follow-up analyses showed that the PTSD group (*M*=2385, *SD*=434) spent significantly more time fixating on the negative-valenced AOI compared with the HC group (*M*=1924, *SD*=627), *t*(61)=3.41, *p*=.001, *Cohen's d*=0.85, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral AOI (*M*=2026, *SD*=362) compared with the HC group (*M*=2681, *SD*=779), *t*(61)=4.34, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=1.08. For the PTSD and TEHC groups, results indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 63)=6.73, *p*=.01, *η2p* =.096, with follow-up analyses showing that the PTSD group spent significantly more time fixating on the negative-valenced AOI compared with the TEHC group (*M*=2187, *SD*=342), *t*(64)=2.06, *p*=.04, *Cohen's d*=0.51, but with no significant difference for dwell time on neutral faces (TEHC; *M*=2063, *SD*=302), *t*(64)=0.46, *p*=.65. For the TEHC and HCgroups, results also indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=13.21, *p*=.001, *η2p* =.18, with follow-up analyses showing that the TEHC group spent significantly more time fixating on the negative-valenced AOI compared with the HC group, *t*(61)=2.09, *p*=.04, *Cohen's d*=0.52, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces, *t*(61)=4.22, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=1.05. Examining the within-group differences between the two AOIs, using paired-samples t-tests, indicated a significant difference for the PTSD group in favor of the negative-valenced AOI, *t*(32)=3.07, *p*=.004, *Cohen's d*=0.90, and for the TEHC group albeit only at a trend-level, *t*(32)=1.89, *p*=.067, *Cohen's d*=0.38. A significant difference also emerged for the HC group, albeit in the opposite direction, favoring the neutral AOI, *t*(29)=2.98, *p*=.006, *Cohen's d*=1.07.

**First fixation dwell time – Session 1, detailed follow-up analyses**

Comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 64)=9.89, *p*=.003, *η2p* =.13. Follow-up between-groups t-tests revealed a higher mean first fixation duration on the negative-valenced AOI in the PTSD group (*M*=321, *SD*=186) compared with the HC group (*M*=240, *SD*=78), *t*(65)=2.22, *p*=.03, *Cohen's d*=0.57, but with no significant difference for dwell time on neutral faces (PTSD; *M*=297, *SD*=179, HC; *M*=278, *SD*=113), *t*(65)=0.48, *p*=.63. Comparing the PTSD and TEHC groups did not reveal a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 68)=1.41, *p*=.24. For the TEHC and HC groups, results indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 61)=5.02, *p*=.015, *η2p* =.08. Follow-up between-group t-tests revealed a higher mean first fixation duration on the negative-valenced AOI in the TEHC group (*M*=308, *SD*=119) compared with the HC group (*M*=240, *SD*=78), *t*(62)=2.65, *p*=.01, *Cohen's d*=0.68, but with no significant difference for dwell time on neutral faces (TEHC; *M*=298, *SD*=119, HC; *M*=113, *SD*=21), *t*(62)=0.69, *p*=.49. Examining the within-group differences between the two AOIs, using paired-samples t-tests, indicated a significant difference only for the PTSD group in favor of the negative-valenced AOI, *t*(36)=2.28, *p*=.03, *Cohen's d*=0.13. Non-significant differences were noted for the TEHC and HC groups.

**First fixation dwell time – Session 2, detailed follow-up analyses**

Analyzing data from Session 2 revealed that while the omnibus Group×AOI×Block was not significant, *F*(2, 92)=.55, *p*=.58, a significant Group×AOI emerged, *F*(2, 92)=4.92, *p*=.009, *η2p* =.10, indicating differential dwell time patterns for the three groups with regard to the two AOIs. Comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=10.48, *p*=.002, *η2p* =.15. Follow-up between-groups t-tests revealed a higher mean first fixation duration on the negative-valenced AOI in the PTSD group (*M*=313, *SD*=149) compared with the HC group (*M*=242, *SD*=55), *t*(61)=2.48, *p*=.016, *Cohen's d*=0.63, but with no significant difference for dwell time on neutral faces (PTSD; *M*=283, *SD*=151, HC; *M*=294, *SD*=123), *t*(61)=0.31, *p*=.76. Comparing the PTSD and TEHC and the TEHC and HC groups did not reveal a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 63)=3.17, *p*=.08, and *F*(1, 60)=2.26, *p*=.14, respectively. Examining the within-group differences between the two AOIs, using paired-samples t-tests, indicated a significant difference for the PTSD group in favor of the negative-valenced AOI, *t*(32)=2.15, *p*=.04, *Cohen's d*=0.20, and for the HC group, albeit in the opposite direction favoring the neutral AOI, *t*(29)=2.49, *p*=.02, *Cohen's d*=0.56. No differences were noted for the TEHC group.

**Eye-tracking data – Within Block Analyses and Results**

**Sustained Attention (total dwell time)**

***The Angry-Neutral Block*.** Total mean dwell times, in milliseconds, by group (PTSD, TEHC, HC) and AOI are presented in Figure S1a. A significant group-by-AOI interaction emerged, *F*(2, 97)=15.10, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.24, indicating differential dwell time patterns for the three groups with regard to the angry and neutral AOIs. Follow-up analyses comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 64)=19.79, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.24. Follow-up t-tests per AOI revealed that the PTSD group (*M*=2419, *SD*=415) spent significantly more time fixating on the angry faces compared with the HC group (*M*=1958, *SD*=670), *t*(65)=3.45, *p*=.001, *Cohen's d*=0.83, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces (*M*=1886, *SD*=376) compared with the HC group (*M*=2645, *SD*=835), *t*(65)=4.95, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=1.17. A significant group-by-AOI interaction also emerged when exploring the PTSD and TEHC groups, *F*(1, 68)=16.42, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.195. Follow-up t-tests revealed that the PTSD group spent significantly more time fixating on the angry faces compared with the TEHC group (*M*=2160, *SD*=428), *t*(69)=2.58, *p*=.01, *Cohen's d*=0.61. No group differences were noted for dwell time on neutral faces (TEHC; *M*=2025, *SD*=368), *t*(69)=1.57, *p*=.10. Finally, comparing the TEHC and HC groups also yielded a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 61)=9.20, *p*=.004, *η2p* =.13. Follow-up t-tests revealed that the HC group spent significantly more time fixating on the neutral faces compared with the TEHC group, *t*(62)=3.92, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=0.87. The groups did not differ on dwell time on angry faces, *t*(62)=1.46, *p*=.15.

Analyzing data from Session 2 revealed similar results to those observed in Session 1. A significant group-by-AOI interaction effect was noted, *F*(2, 92)=16.80, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.27. Comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=20.16, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.25. Follow-up analyses showed that the PTSD group (*M*=2450, *SD*=381) spent significantly more time fixating on the angry faces compared with the HC group (*M*=1926, *SD*=737), *t*(61)=3.59, *p*=.001, *Cohen's d*=0.89, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces (*M*=2013, *SD*=384) compared with the HC group (*M*=2887, *SD*=852), *t*(61)=5.32, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=1.32. For the PTSD and TEHC groups, results indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 63)=6.58, *p*=.01, *η2p* =.095, with follow-up analyses showing the PTSD group to spend significantly more time fixating on the angry faces compared with the TEHC group (*M*=2189, *SD*=354), *t*(64)=2.58, *p*=.005, *Cohen's d*=0.71, but with no significant difference for dwell time on neutral faces (TEHC; *M*=2055, *SD*=347), *t*(64)=0.46, *p*=.65. For the TEHC and HC groups, results also indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=14.84, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.20. Follow-up analyses revealed that the HC group spent significantly more time fixating on the neutral faces compared with the TEHC group, *t*(61)=5.16, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=1.28, with no differences on dwell time on angry faces, *t*(61)=1.46, *p*=.07.

Internal consistency for total dwell time on angry faces, total dwell time on neutral faces, and the percentage of total dwell time on angry faces out of total dwell time spent on both angry and neutral faces for the 30 matrices presented in Session 1 were high, with Cronbach’s alphas of .83, .95, and .91, respectively. Internal consistency remained high in Session 2, conducted one week later, with Cronbach’s alphas of .89, .97, and .93, respectively. One-week test-retest reliability was significant for total dwell time on angry faces, *r*(96)=.82, *p*<.001, neutral faces, *r*(96)=.87, *p*<.001, and percentage dwell time on angry faces, *r*(96)=.87, *p*<.001.

***The Fear-Neutral Block*.** Total mean dwell times, in milliseconds, by group (PTSD, TEHC, HC) and AOI are presented in Figure S1b. A significant group-by-AOI interaction effect emerged, *F*(2, 97)=15.78, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.245, indicating differential dwell time patterns for the three groups with regard to the fearful and neutral AOIs. Follow-up analyses comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 64)=18.59, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.225. Follow-up t-tests on total dwell time on per AOI revealed that the PTSD group (*M*=2381, *SD*=487) spent significantly more time fixating on the fearful faces compared with the HC group (*M*=1944, *SD*=647), *t*(65)=3.15, *p*=.002, *Cohen's d*=0.76, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces (*M*=1920, *SD*=437) compared with the HC group (*M*=2654, *SD*=807), *t*(65)=4.74, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=1.13. Examining the PTSD and TEHC groups did not reveal a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 68)=2.63, *p*=.11. Finally, comparing the TEHC and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 61)=16.02, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.21, with follow-up t-tests revealing that the TEHC group (*M*=2219, *SD*=389) spent significantly more time fixating on the fearful faces compared with the HC group, *t*(62)=2.03, *p*=.04, *Cohen's d*=0.52, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces (*M*=1938, *SD*=346), compared with the HC group, *t*(62)=4.71, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=1.15.

Analyzing data from Session 2 revealed similar results to those observed in Session 1. A significant group-by-AOI interaction effect was noted, *F*(2, 92)=7.72, *p*=.001, *η2p* =.14. Comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=8.68, *p*=.005, *η2p* =.13. Follow-up analyses showed that the PTSD group (*M*=2325, *SD*=585) spent significantly more time fixating on the fearful faces compared with the HC group (*M*=1979, *SD*=653), *t*(61)=2.21, *p*=.03, *Cohen's d*=0.56, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces (*M*=2084, *SD*=510) compared with the HC group (*M*=2604, *SD*=804), *t*(61)=3.10, *p*=.003, *Cohen's d*=0.77. Comparing the PTSD and TEHC groups did not reveal a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 63)=1.05, *p*=.31. For the TEHC and HC groups, results indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=9.10, *p*=.004, *η2p* =.13, with follow-up analyses showing that the TEHC group (*M*=2242, *SD*=314) spent significantly more time fixating on the fearful faces compared with the HC group, *t*(61)=2.06, *p*=.04, *Cohen's d*=0.51, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces (*M*=2075, *SD*=285) compared with the HC group, *t*(61)=3.55, *p*=.001, *Cohen's d*=0.88.

Internal consistency for total dwell time on fearful faces, neutral faces, and the percentage of total dwell time on fearful faces out of total dwell time spent on both fearful and neutral faces for the 30 matrices presented in Session 1 were high, with Cronbach’s alphas of .82, .96, and .93, respectively. Internal consistency remained high in Session 2, conducted one week later, with Cronbach’s alphas of .83, .95, and .91, respectively. One-week test-retest reliability was significant for total dwell time on fearful faces, *r*(96)=.73, *p*<.001, neutral faces, *r*(96)=.79, *p*<.001, and percentage dwell time on fearful faces, *r*(96)=.75, *p*<.001.

***The Sad-Neutral Block*.** Total mean dwell times, in milliseconds, by group (PTSD, TEHC, HC) and AOI are presented in Figure S1c. A significant group-by-AOI interaction effect emerged, *F*(2, 97)=13.67, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.22, indicating differential dwell time patterns for the three groups with regard to the sad and neutral AOIs. Follow-up analyses comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 64)=18.25, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.22. Follow-up analyses per AOI revealed that the PTSD group (*M*=2407, *SD*=544) spent significantly more time fixating on the sad faces compared with the HC group (*M*=1981, *SD*=651), *t*(65)=2.91, *p*=.005, *Cohen's d*=0.71, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces (*M*=2046, *SD*=424) compared with the HC group (*M*=2698, *SD*=896), *t*(65)=3.92, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=0.93. Examining the PTSD and TEHC groups also indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 68)=5.57, *p*=.02, *η2p* =.08. Follow-up analyses revealed no group differences on dwell time on sad or neutral faces. Finally, comparing the TEHC and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction as well, *F*(1, 61)=11.10, *p*=.001, *η2p* =.15, with follow-up analyses showing that the HC group spent significantly more time fixating on the neutral faces compared with the TEHC group, (*M*=2064, *SD*=320), *t*(62)=3.85, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=0.94. The groups did not differ on dwell time on sad faces (TEHC; *M*=2197, *SD*=391), *t*(62)=1.63, *p*=.11.

Analyzing data from Session 2 also revealed a significant group-by-AOI interaction effect, *F*(2, 92)=13.68, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.23. Comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=19.70, *p*<.001, *η2p* =.25. Follow-up analyses showed that the PTSD group (*M*=2379, *SD*=587) spent significantly more time fixating on the sad faces compared with the HC group (*M*=1947, *SD*=682), *t*(61)=2.70, *p*=.009, *Cohen's d*=0.68, and significantly less time fixating on the neutral faces (*M*=1979, *SD*=519) compared with the HC group (*M*=2652, *SD*=814), *t*(61)=3.95, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=.99. For the PTSD and TEHC groups, results indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 63)=7.14, *p*=.01, *η2p* =.102, with follow-up analyses showing that the PTSD group spent significantly more time fixating on the sad faces compared with the TEHC group (*M*=2114, *SD*=324), *t*(64)=2.28, *p*=.03, *Cohen's d*=0.56, with no group differences on dwell time on neutral faces (TEHC; *M*=2062, *SD*=341), *t*(64)=0.77, *p*=.44. For the TEHC and HC groups, results also indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 60)=10.51, *p*=.002, *η2p* =.15. Follow-up analyses revealed that the HC group spent significantly more time fixating on the neutral faces compared with the TEHC group, *t*(61)=3.81, *p*<.001, *Cohen's d*=0.94, with no group differences for dwell time on sad faces, *t*(61)=1.26, *p*=.21.

Internal consistency for total dwell time on sad faces, neutral faces, and the percentage of total dwell time on sad faces out of total dwell time spent on both sad and neutral faces for the 30 matrices presented in Session 1 were high, with Cronbach’s alphas of .90, .96, and .94, respectively. Internal consistency remained high in Session 2, conducted one week later, with Cronbach’s alphas of .94, .96, and .93, respectively. One-week test-retest reliability was significant for total dwell time on sad faces, *r*(96)=.82, *p*<.001, neutral faces, *r*(96)=.87, *p*<.001, and percentage dwell time on sad faces, *r*(96)=.88, *p*<.001.

**First fixation measures**

***The Anger-Neutral Block*.** As expected, non-significant group-by-AOI interaction effects were noted for first fixation latency, *F*(2, 97)=.84, *p*=.43, and first fixation location, *F*(2, 97)=.13, *p*=.88. For first fixation dwell time (Figure S2a), a significant group-by-AOI interaction effect emerged, *F*(2, 97)=4.63, *p*=.01, *η2p* =.09. Comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 64)=5.82, *p*=.02, *η2p* =.08. Follow-up between-group t-tests revealed no significant group differences for first fixation dwell time on angry or neutral faces. Comparing the PTSD and TEHC groups did not reveal a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 68)=0.0, *p*=.98. For the TEHC and HC groups, results indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 61)=6.29, *p*=.01, *η2p* =.09. Follow-up between-group t-tests revealed no significant group differences for first fixation dwell time on angry or neutral faces.

***The Fear-Neutral Block*.** As expected, non-significant group-by-AOI interaction effects were noted for first fixation latency, *F*(2, 97)=.58, *p*=.56, and first fixation location, *F*(2, 97)=1.45, *p*=.24. A non-significant interaction emerged also for first fixation dwell time, *F*(2, 97)=.22, *p*=.80 (Figure S2b).

***The Sad-Neutral Block*.** As expected, non-significant group-by-AOI interaction effects were noted for first fixation latency, *F*(2, 97)=3.80, *p*=.08, and first fixation location, *F*(2, 97)=1.15, *p*=.32. For first fixation dwell time (Figure S2c), a significant group-by-AOI interaction effect emerged, *F*(2, 97)=5.29, *p*=.007, *η2p* =1.00. Comparing the PTSD and HC groups indicated a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 64)=10.18, *p*=.002, *η2p* =.14. Follow-up between-group t-tests revealed no significant group differences for first fixation dwell time on sad or neutral faces. Comparing the PTSD and TEHC and the PTSD and TEHC groups did not reveal a significant group-by-AOI interaction, *F*(1, 68)=2.85, *p*=.10., and *F*(1, 61)=2.94, *p*=.09, respectively.

**Correlation analysis**

***The Anger-Neutral Block*.** Percentage of total dwell time on angry faces out of total dwell time spent on both angry and neutral faces was positively correlated with CAPS-5 scores, *r*(71)=.36, *p*=.002, and with the HAM-D and HAM-A scores, *r*(101)=.37, *p*<.001 and *r*(101)=.20, *p*=.04, respectively.

***The Fear-Neutral Block*.** Percentage of total dwell time on fearful faces out of total dwell time spent on both fearful and neutral faces was positively correlated only with HAM-D scores, *r*(101)=.29, *p*=.004.

***The Sad-Neutral Block*.** Percentage of total dwell time on sad faces out of total dwell time spent on both sad and neutral faces was positively correlated only with HAM-D scores, *r*(101)=.30, *p*=.002.
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