The authors have responded well to each of the points raised in the previous review. The explanations provided are very helpful. Great work! I have no further major comments for this paper. I have just a few minor comments/edits below.

1. Use the term ‘perceived exertion’ rather than ‘physical exertion’ whenever referring to exertion that is perceived. Physical exertion is usually measured objectively (e.g., heart rate, VO2) and therefore is something slightly different. This may seem a minor point (and I can only imagine how difficult such nuances are in a non-native language), but it is important for clarity.

Below are some suggested corrections from the abstract:

“…We aim to examine this research question by using ecological momentary assessment of ~~physical~~ perceived exertion to be filled out before (anticipatory RPE) and after (retrospective RPE, retrospective pleasure) each running session of a start-to-run program. By capitalizing on the core dynamic of reward prediction errors, we hypothesize that running sessions that are experienced with a lesser level of ~~physical~~ perceived exertion than anticipated (a positive RPE-based prediction error) should be associated with a higher level of retrospective pleasure ~~during~~ following the session of physical exercise, and vice versa (higher score of retrospective RPE than prospective RPE; a negative RPE-based prediction error).”

1. Some suggested edits for Page 3:

Indeed, the level of ~~physical~~ perceived exertion is usually indexed while exercising (i.e., momentary ratings of perceived exertion [RPE]; e.g., “What intensity of exertion do you feel now?”) or directly after the exercise session (i.e., retrospective RPE; e.g., “What intensity of exertion did you feel during this session?”; or “How was your workout?”; Foster et al., 2001; Haile et al., 2015; Robertson ~~and~~ & Noble, 1997). Inside parentheses, abbreviations should be used.

1. Where you added the detail about music on page 8, I think it would be useful to mention that this will be considered as a covariate. Suggested edit:

Specifically, participants will be encouraged to self-select their running frequency, intensity, and duration, in which they will be allowed to undertake these sessions alone or in groups, where they want. Participants will also be allowed to listen to music if they want to. These variables (i.e., presence of others and music listening) will be recorded and included as covariates in the analysis, see section 2.6.2).”

1. Section 2.5.1: Use “assessed” or measured rather than undertaken. Also, the word perceived is not needed in this sentence (it is included in the abbreviation). Suggestion:

***Prediction error of RPE.*** RPE will be ~~undertaken~~ assessed directly before (prospective RPE) and after (retrospective RPE) each running session on the Formyfit app (see **Figure 1**). Based on Foster and colleagues’ findings (2001), participants will be asked to provide a prospective or retrospective rating of their ~~perceived~~ RPE of the overall running session.

1. Section 2.5.2. Regarding the instrument to measure retrospective running pleasure. I think this could just be a translation issue, but the responses for 0 (“not at all”) and 6 (“extremely”) do not match the question for this measure. If asking “What intensity of pleasure did you feel during this session?” then perhaps the translation should be 0 (“none at all”) to 6 (“extreme”)? The other integers of (1 = “very little”, 2 = “slightly”, 3 = “moderately”, 4 = “quite a bit”, 5 = “very much”) are good.