

Supplementary Figure 1: Subjective and psychophysiological measures of fear acquisition and extinction.^a

^a A) Normalized (square-root transform) skin conductance response (SCR) B) Standardized fear potentiated startle measured through electromyography (EMG) of the eyeblink reflex C) Subjective ratings of anxiety. CS+=conditioned stimulus paired with unconditioned stimulus (UCS), CS-=conditioned stimulus never paired with UCS, ISI=Inter-stimulus interval. Data from 23 anxious youths, 18 anxious adults, 42 healthy youths and 31 healthy adults are summarized. Significance is defined as α =0.05.

^b Anxiety-related difference.

^c Age-group difference.

Overall, SCR was greater in youths than adults [all F(1,96)>12.7, p<0.02] and the reported fear was greater in anxious than healthy individuals [F(1,109)=19.3, p<0.001]. During fear acquisition, fear conditioning (CS+>CS-) was demonstrated in all measures [SCR: mean difference between CS+ and CS-= 0.1, t(99)=4.8, p<0.001, EMG: mean difference between CS+ and CS-=2.0, t(113)=4.3, p<0.001, subjective fear: mean difference between CS+ and CS-=1.9, t(113)=7.9, p<0.001; all group effects p>0.1]. During extinction, the EMG response to CS+ and CS- were more similar in adults than in youths [age-group×CS-type interaction: F(2,220)=4.2, p<0.02 and the subjective ratings of fear were similar to those in extinction for both anxious adults and anxious youths [F(2,218)=4.5, p<0.02]. In addition, only anxious youths showed similar responses to the CS+ and CS-, reflecting elevated fear to the CS- [ns, p>0.2].



Supplementary Figure

2: Threat appraisal and explicit memory elicit different patterns of behavioral response.^a

^a Averaged behavioral data demonstrate differences based on cognitive state. Data from 14 anxious youths, 15 anxious adults, 25 healthy youths, and 28 healthy adults are summarized. Significance is defined as α =0.05. ^b Significant quadratic response across groups.

The quadratic pattern in the responses and reaction times to morphed images continuously varying in similarity from the CS- (0%) to CS+ (100%) is less dramatic during threat appraisal (Panels A and B, respectively) than explicit memory (Panels C, D) Subjective response: instruction×Morph²-Level interaction: *F*(2,1931)=4.2, *p*<0.01; threat appraisal: β=0.003, SE=0.001, t(899)=2.6, p<0.001; explicit memory: β=0.008, SE=0.001, t(899)=7.5, p<0.001. Reaction time: instruction×Morph²-Level interaction: F(2,1960)=19.3, p<0.01; threat appraisal: p>0.1, explicit memory: $\beta=-$ 7.9, SE=1.2, t(899)=6.5, *p*<0.001]. No group differences in quadratic patterns across morphed images were noted [all p>0.2].