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Emotion dysregulation is a common issue experienced by individuals with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and has been associated with a wide range of negative mental and physical health outcomes. This commentary highlights the role emotion dysregulation plays in ASD by first considering the literature on emotion regulation (ER) in the general population and then summarizing the ER research in ASD. Based on the evaluation of previous research findings, we conclude that individuals with ASD have more ER difficulties and consistently self-report or demonstrate a less adaptive pattern of ER strategy use. In addition, the higher prevalence of internalizing and externalizing issues seen in ASD are associated with the greater habitual use of some ER strategies and less habitual use of others. Conceptual and methodological limitations are discussed, including the use of coping measures and single-method approaches, and ASD gender distribution. We propose a set of new directions for investigating ER in ASD, incorporating knowledge from other literatures on the role of flexibility in healthy adaptation, overlaps between flexibility and executive function deficits, the adaptive value of up-regulation of positive emotions, and the importance of emotional self-awareness. Increasing our capacity for identifying the mechanisms underlying co-morbid affective disorders can ultimately inform the design of effective interventions to maximize the wellbeing of individuals with ASD.

Lay Summary: Research has shown that people diagnosed with autism tend to have difficulties with regulating their own emotions. This commentary article summarizes the main information from emotion regulation research conducted both in autism and in other populations. We make suggestions on how we can improve emotion regulation research in autism, with the ultimate goal being to use the learning gained from research to design effective interventions that can improve the wellbeing of people with autism.
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Knowing what we feel is the first step to knowing why we feel that way. If we are aware of the constant changes in our inner and outer environment, we can mobilize to manage them [Van der Kolk, 2014].

Anxiety and depression are among the most prevalent affective disorders associated with autism spectrum disorder [ASD; American Psychiatric Association 2013; Croen et al., 2015; Totsika, Hastings, Emerson, Lancaster, & Berridge, 2011]. Reported prevalence ranges between 14% and 84% for anxiety, and between 17% and 70% for depression [Croen et al., 2015; Kim, Szatmari, Bryson, Streiner, & Wilson, 2000; Lainhart, 1999; Lugnegard, Hallerbäck, & Gillberg, 2011; Hofvander et al., 2009; Mazzone, Rutu, & Reale, 2012; Muris, Steerneman, Merckelbach, Holdrinet, & Meesters, 1998]. Higher rates of anxiety and depression in individuals with ASD have been associated with lower life satisfaction and greater social difficulties [Gotham, Brunwasser, & Lord, 2015; White & Roberson-Nay, 2009], externalizing problems including aggression and self-injury [Folstein, 2012], loneliness [White & Roberson-Nay, 2009], and insomnia symptoms [Richdale, Baker, Short, & Gradisar, 2014]. However reasons for these high rates of co-morbid anxiety and depression remain speculative, and researchers have begun to focus on the potential importance of emotion regulation (ER) as a mental health risk factor in ASD [Weiss, Thomson, & Chan, 2014; White et al., 2014]. ER is a particularly promising avenue for exploration, since...
emotion dysregulation is shown to be a trans-diagnostic risk factor for mental health conditions in the general population [Aldao, Gee, De Los Reyes, & Seager, 2016; Gross & John, 2003] that is malleable by treatment [e.g., Blackledge & Hayes, 2001]. By way of contextualizing the subsequent discussion of gaps in our knowledge about ER in ASD, this commentary first considers the literature on ER in the general population, next examines nascent ER research in ASD, and then proposes directions for future research on ER in ASD.

**Emotion Regulation in the General Population**

Traditionally thought to be irrational and to cause problems in adaptive functioning [for an overview, see Damasio, 1994], emotions are now suggested to enable our adaption to environmental demands via activation of attentional, behavioral, and physiological resources [Levenson, 1994; Emotion regulation is a complex process that involves the monitoring and modification of emotional responses that is goal-directed [Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2004], can be either effortful or automatic [Gyurak, Gross, & Etkin, 2011], and aims to modify the intensity, duration, and types of emotions experienced [Thompson, 1991]. Emotion dysregulation occurs when emotions are inappropriately and ineffectively regulated and may manifest itself in negative affectivity or irritability. The first step of ER is to identify emotions that need regulating [Gross, 2015], which then triggers the implementation of ER strategies to either increase or decrease these emotions. We typically accept our positive emotions more openly and try to regulate our negative emotions to help ourselves feel better and solve life and social problems.

Amongst all the frameworks for conceptualizing the approaches people use to regulate their emotions [e.g., Koole, 2009; Larsen, 2000], the process model of ER [Gross, 1998], which describes ER as a multicomponent and dynamic process between the individual and their context, is the most influential and widely known. The process model defines five families of ER strategies: (1) situation selection (e.g., avoiding or approaching specific situations); (2) situation modification (e.g., problem solving); (3) attentional deployment (e.g., paying attention toward or away from information); (4) cognitive change (e.g., modifying appraisals of a situation); and (5) response modulation (e.g., extent to which an emotion is expressed outwardly). Each family (or category) of ER encompasses strategies that are either adaptive or maladaptive to physical and mental health, and general wellbeing [Gross & John, 2003] when they are used in a habitual manner over prolonged periods. For example, cognitive change encompasses negative rumination, which involves a repetitive focus on negative events or feelings such as sadness and apathy [Morrow & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1990] and cognitive reappraisal, which involves re-interpretation of the situation to modify emotions [Lazarus & Alpert, 1964]. There are a variety of ways to categorize ER strategies, including implicit or explicit [e.g., Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2004], intrinsic or extrinsic [e.g., Thompson, 1991], conscious or unconscious [e.g., Bargh & Williams, 2007], voluntary or involuntary [e.g., Mauss, Bunge, & Gross, 2007], antecedent- or response-focused [e.g., Gross & Muñoz, 1995], and avoidant or approach [e.g., Shaver & Mikulincer, 2014]. Although a comprehensive discussion on the conceptualization of ER is beyond the purpose and scope of this commentary, we have largely focused on the adaptive and maladaptive categorization of ER strategy types because strategies differentially predict long-term mental health and wellbeing outcomes and are therefore potentially informative in terms of clinical practice.

Generally, it is agreed that healthy ER is characterized by the successful up-regulation of positive emotions and down-regulation of negative emotions [Gross, 2002; Giuliani, McRae, & Gross, 2008; Ochsner et al., 2004]. Research on the down-regulation of negative emotions has shown that the habitual use of certain strategies (such as avoidance, expressive suppression, denial, and negative rumination) is associated with more negative emotions as well as higher sympathetic activation, impaired memory, disrupted communication and social bonds in relationship formation, and internalizing symptoms such as anxiety and depression [Butler et al., 2003; Berking & Wupperman, 2012; Campbell-Sills, Barlow, Brown, & Hofmann, 2006; Compare, Zarbo, Shonin, Van Gordon, & Marconi, 2014; Gross, 1998; Gross & John, 2003; Joormann & Gotlib, 2010; Liverant, Kamholz, Sloan, & Brown, 2011; Richards, Butler, & Gross, 2003; Richards & Gross, 2000; Silk, Steinberg, & Morris, 2003]. Therefore, these strategies are typically considered to be maladaptive for the individual when they are used in a habitual manner due to their relationships with poorer outcomes. In contrast, the habitual use of strategies such as cognitive reappraisal, problem solving, and acceptance is thought to be more adaptive as it is related to reduced negative affect, improved memory, diminished cardiac reactivity, and lower levels of anxiety and depression [Campbell-Sills et al., 2006; Eftekhari, Zoellner, & Vigil, 2009; Garnefski, Legersee, Kraaij, Van den Kommer, & Teers, 2002; Goldin, McRae, Ramel, & Gross, 2007; Joormann & Gotlib, 2010; Liverant, Brown, Barlow, & Roemer, 2008; Troy, Wilhelm, Shallcross, & Mauss, 2010].

Although we have categorized the habitual use of certain ER strategies as adaptive and others as maladaptive, we would like to caution the reader that this does not mean “adaptive” or “maladaptive” strategies are useful...
or unhelpful respectively across all situations. Evidence from recent research in the general population indicates that the inflexible reliance on particular ER strategies (even if they are generally thought to be adaptive) has negative consequences. For example, even though cognitive reappraisal has generally been shown to be associated with better mental health and wellbeing, this is not evident across all contexts. Troy, Shalilcross, and Mauss [2013] showed that this relationship is evident only in the context of stress that is uncontrollable. In controllable stressful situations, higher cognitive reappraisal was associated with poorer psychological health. Instead of cognitive reappraisal, acceptance of both the situation and experience is shown to be more adaptive in uncontrollable situations [Hayes & Wilson, 1994].

It is worth noting that emotion dysregulation may not be the result of ER strategy use per se. There are other factors that may cause emotion dysregulation, for example, the inability to identify one’s own emotions or effectively monitor emotional changes post strategy use. Sheppes, Suri, and Gross [2015] listed the regulatory stages where dysregulation may occur, which can then lead to specific mental health conditions (see Table 1 in their review).

Research in the general population has shown the benefits of positive emotions [Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005], and that in affective disorders the up-regulation and maintenance of positive emotions are as important as the down-regulation of negative emotions [Carl, Soskin, Kerns, & Barlow, 2013]. It has been suggested that positive emotions broaden individuals’ cognitive and behavioral repertoires [Fredrickson, 2004]. Specifically, the successful regulation of positive emotions via strategies such as positive rumination, savoring positive experiences, and sharing positive events is associated with increased positive affect, life satisfaction, optimism, self-esteem, happiness, and higher relationship wellbeing including better intimacy and relationship satisfaction [Bryant, 2003; Gable, Reis, Impett, & Asher, 2004; Quoidbach, Berry, Hansenne, & Mikolajczak, 2010; Raes, Smets, Nelis, & Schoofs, 2012]. Additionally, these studies showed the use of strategies to regulate positive emotions is also negatively related to hopelessness, negative affect, and depression symptoms.

In addition to empirical studies that assessed the relationships between ER strategy use and health outcomes, meta-analytic reviews have revealed: (1) less frequent use of certain ER strategies and more frequent use of other strategies are associated with depressive and anxiety symptoms in adolescents [Schäfer, Naumann, Holmes, Tuschen-Caffier, & Samson, 2016]; and (2) a larger magnitude in the relationship between maladaptive strategies and psychopathology than adaptive strategies and psychopathology [Aldao, Nolen-Hoeksema, & Schweizer, 2010].

Emotion Regulation in ASD

Research on ER in both children and adults with ASD has emerged recently, largely focusing on group differences in overall ER strategy use, and the relationship between ER and a range of outcomes, including mental health and social engagement (see Table 1 for a summary of research to date). More than half of these studies included participants with ASD who had average cognitive capacity overall, whilst other studies either included individuals with lower cognitive capacity or did not provide information regarding participants’ cognitive function. Poor ER may be inherent in ASD [Mazefsky et al., 2013; Mazefsky & White, 2014], and recent evidence supports this view [e.g., Konstantareas & Stewart, 2006; Nader-Grosbois & Mazzone, 2014; Pitskel, Bolling, Kaiser, Pelphrey, & Crowley, 2014; Richey et al., 2015; Samson et al., 2014]. All ASD core symptoms have been shown to be linked to emotion dysregulation [Berkovits, Eisenhower, & Blacher, 2017], with restricted and repetitive behaviors, interests, and activities being the strongest predictor [Samson et al., 2014].

Overall, ER research shows that when compared to typically developing (TD) participants, individuals with ASD generally have more ER difficulties, are less effective at using ER strategies, and show a maladaptive pattern of strategy use [e.g., Konstantareas & Stewart, 2006; Nader-Grosbois & Mazzone, 2014; Pitskel et al., 2014; Richey et al., 2015; Samson et al., 2014]. Examining the use of specific ER strategies, a majority of research has found evidence for less frequent use of adaptive ER strategies among ASD individuals [Bruggink, Huisman, Vuijk, Kraaij, & Garnefski, 2016; Jahromi, Meek, & Ober-Reynolds, 2012; Konstantareas & Stewart, 2006; Rieffe et al., 2011; Rieffe, De Bruine, & Rooij, & Stockmann, 2014; Samson, Huber, & Gross, 2012; Samson, Hardan, Lee, Phillips, & Gross, 2015; Samson, Hardan, Podell, & Gross, 2015; Samson, Wells, Phillips, Hardan, & Gross, 2015]. Nevertheless, some studies report similar use of adaptive strategies as control participants [Mazefsky, Bore, Day, & Minshew, 2014; Pouw, Rieffe, Stockmann, & Gadow, 2013; Samson, Hardan, Podell et al., 2015].

Findings concerning maladaptive strategy use have been more diverse, with research showing more [Bruggink et al., 2016; Jahromi et al., 2012; Mazefsky et al., 2014; Samson et al., 2012; Samson, Hardan, Podell et al., 2015; Samson, Wells et al., 2015], similar [Pouw et al., 2013; Rieffe et al., 2011; Rieffe et al., 2014; Samson, Hardan, Podell et al., 2015; Samson, Hardan, Lee...
Table 1. Summary of Research: ER and Associated Outcomes in ASD Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>ASD Sample</th>
<th>Age range in years</th>
<th>ASD Male (TD Male)</th>
<th>Cognitive function</th>
<th>Outcomes measured</th>
<th>Comparison with control group on outcomes</th>
<th>Regulation strategies</th>
<th>Comparison with control</th>
<th>Measure(s) used for capturing ER</th>
<th>Relationship to outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkovits et al. [2017]</td>
<td>108 children</td>
<td>4–7</td>
<td>82.4% (N/A)</td>
<td>Estimated FSIQ (WPPSI-III)</td>
<td>M = 90.3 12% IQ below 70</td>
<td>N/A—No control group</td>
<td>N/A—Employed measures do not capture ER strategy use</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Parent-report ER Checklist [Shields &amp; Cicchetti, 1997] and Emotion Dysregulation Index [Samson et al., 2014]</td>
<td>ER predicted social skills, internalizing and externalizing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruggink et al. [2016]</td>
<td>121 adults</td>
<td>38–62</td>
<td>78.5% (78.5%)</td>
<td>N/A—No mention of cognitive ability</td>
<td>Anxiety and depression</td>
<td>Higher levels of anxiety and depression symptoms</td>
<td>Putting into perspective Positive refocusing Positive reappraisal Acceptance Refocus on planning Cognitive reappraisal</td>
<td>Self-blame Other-blame Rumination Catastrophizing</td>
<td>Less More</td>
<td>Self-report Cognitive ER Questionnaire [Garnefski &amp; Kraaij, 2001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai et al. [2018a]</td>
<td>61 adolescents and young adults</td>
<td>14–24</td>
<td>70.4% (N/A)</td>
<td>No cognitive assessment conducted</td>
<td>Anxiety and depression</td>
<td>N/A—No control group</td>
<td>Cognitive reappraisal</td>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Self-report ER Questionnaire [Gross &amp; John, 2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai et al. [2018b]</td>
<td>121 adolescents and adults</td>
<td>14–79</td>
<td>50.4% (N/A)</td>
<td>No cognitive assessment conducted</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>N/A—No control group</td>
<td>Cognitive reappraisal</td>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Self-report ER Questionnaire [Gross &amp; John, 2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahromi et al. [2012]</td>
<td>20 children</td>
<td>3–6</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Mental age (GCA)</td>
<td>M = 57.59 months</td>
<td>N/A—No outcomes measured</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Goal-directed action Alternative strategies Distraction Self-speech Social support Self-soothing</td>
<td>Vocal venting Physical venting Disruptive behavior Avoidance</td>
<td>Less More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahromi et al. [2013]</td>
<td>20 children</td>
<td>M = 5 (range not provided)</td>
<td>90.0% (Not presented—specified matched on gender)</td>
<td>Mental age (GCA)</td>
<td>M = 57.59 months</td>
<td>Emotional and behavioral school engagement and pro-social peer engagement</td>
<td>Liked school less, no difference on school avoidance, less emotionally engaged and less pro-social peer engagement.</td>
<td>N/A—Employed measure does not capture ER strategy use</td>
<td>No measure for strategy use. Found ASD children scored lower on overall emotion regulation</td>
<td>Parent-report ER Checklist [Shields &amp; Cicchetti, 1997]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Age range in years</td>
<td>ASD Male (TD Male)</td>
<td>Cognitive function</td>
<td>Outcomes measured</td>
<td>Comparison with control group on outcomes</td>
<td>Regulation strategies</td>
<td>Comparison with control group on outcomes</td>
<td>Measure(s) used for capturing ER</td>
<td>Relationship to outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantareas and Stewart [2006]</td>
<td>3–10</td>
<td>63.2% (Not specified—matched on gender)</td>
<td>No mental age information. Individual DP II scores provided.</td>
<td>N/A—No outcomes measured</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ASD children used less adaptive strategies and a greater range of these strategies</td>
<td>Experimental coding of affect regulation strategies based on Grolnick, Bridges, and Connell [1996] study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazefsky et al. [2014]</td>
<td>12–19</td>
<td>96.0% (95.7%)</td>
<td>Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)</td>
<td>Internalizing and externalizing problems</td>
<td>Higher levels of psychopathology overall</td>
<td>Voluntary engagement</td>
<td>Voluntary disengagement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Parent-report ER Checklist [Nader-Grosbois &amp; Mazzone, 2014]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouw et al. [2013]</td>
<td>9–15</td>
<td>100.0% (100.0%)</td>
<td>Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)</td>
<td>Internalizing and externalizing problems</td>
<td>Approach coping</td>
<td>Maladaptive coping</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Self-report Coping Scale [Wright, Banejee, Hoek, Rieffe, &amp; Novin, 2010]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rieffe et al. [2011]</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>87.9% (88.1%)</td>
<td>Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)</td>
<td>Depression symptoms</td>
<td>Adaptive coping strategies (e.g., planning, acceptance)</td>
<td>Maladaptive coping strategies (e.g., catastrophizing and self-blame)</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Self-report Coping Questionnaire for Kids [Garmeski, Rieffe, Jellesma, Terwogt, &amp; Kraaij, 2007]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rieffe et al. [2014]</td>
<td>9–34</td>
<td>89.0% (45%)</td>
<td>Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)</td>
<td>Depression symptoms</td>
<td>Approach coping</td>
<td>Worry/ruminating</td>
<td>More approach coping</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Self-report Coping Scale [Wright et al., 2010]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson et al. [2012]</td>
<td>18–53</td>
<td>41.0% (41.0%)</td>
<td>No IQ information (assumed high functioning due to educational level)</td>
<td>Depression symptoms</td>
<td>Approach coping</td>
<td>Avoidant coping</td>
<td>More suppression coping</td>
<td>Less suppression coping</td>
<td>Self-report ER Questionnaire [Gross &amp; John, 2003]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson, Hardan, Lee et al. [2015]</td>
<td>8–20</td>
<td>87.1% (75.0%)</td>
<td>Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)</td>
<td>Depression symptoms</td>
<td>Cognitive reappraisal</td>
<td>Less suppression</td>
<td>Self-report and parent-report ER Questionnaire [Gross &amp; John, 2003]</td>
<td>Less suppression</td>
<td>The low use of an adaptive strategy predicted maladaptive behaviors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>ASD Sample</td>
<td>Age range in years</td>
<td>ASD Male (TD Male)</td>
<td>Cognitive function</td>
<td>Outcomes measured</td>
<td>Comparison with control group on outcomes</td>
<td>Regulation strategies</td>
<td>Comparison with control strategies</td>
<td>Measure(s) used for capturing ER strategy use</td>
<td>Relationship to outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson, Hardan, Podell et al. [2015]</td>
<td>21 children, adolescents, and young adults</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>85.7% (72.7%)</td>
<td>FSIQ (SB-5) M = 103.33</td>
<td>N/A—No outcomes measured</td>
<td>N/A—No outcomes measured</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>Less reappraisal</td>
<td>Reactivity and Regulation Situation Task (adaptation of Catty, Horesh, Apter, Edge, &amp; Gross, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson, Wells et al. [2015]</td>
<td>32 children, adolescents, and young adults</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>90.6% (74.2%)</td>
<td>FSIQ (SB-5) M = 104.31, Range = 64-129</td>
<td>N/A—No outcomes measured</td>
<td>N/A—No outcomes measured</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>More suppression</td>
<td>Self-report daily diaries Parent-report Emotion Regulation Interview [adapted from Werner, Goldin, Ball, Heimberg, &amp; Gross, 2011]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson et al. [2016]</td>
<td>18 children, adolescents, and young adults</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>88.9% (83.3%)</td>
<td>FSIQ (SB-5) M = 104.00, Range = 74-129</td>
<td>N/A—No outcomes measured</td>
<td>N/A—Employed measure does not capture ER strategy use</td>
<td>N/A—Employed measure does not capture ER strategy use</td>
<td>N/A—Employed measure does not capture ER strategy use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swain et al. [2015]</td>
<td>69 adults</td>
<td>17-27</td>
<td>71.0% (N/A)</td>
<td>IQ &gt; 70 (eligibility criterion) however no details have been provided</td>
<td>Social anxiety N/A—No control group</td>
<td>N/A—Employed measure does not capture ER strategy use</td>
<td>N/A—Employed measure does not capture ER strategy use</td>
<td>N/A—Employed measure does not capture ER strategy use</td>
<td>ER predicted social anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
et al., 2015; Samson, Wells et al., 2015], and less frequent [Samson, Hardan, Lee et al., 2015; Samson, Wells et al., 2015] use in ASD. Samson, Hardan, Lee et al. [2015] and Samson, Wells et al. [2015] used both self- and parent-reports of ER in samples of participants with ASD aged 8–20 years, and found same amount of expressive suppression use [self-report in Samson, Wells et al., 2015 and parent-report in Samson, Hardan, Lee et al., 2015] and less use of suppression [parent-report in Samson, Wells et al., 2015 and self-report in Samson, Hardan, Lee et al., 2015]. The authors suggested their unexpected findings might be due to the difficulty parents may have had reporting their child’s use of ER strategies and the wide age range of participants, as controlling emotional expression is more difficult for children and adolescents than for adults. Building on the latter point, the age range of participants in these two papers encompassed separate developmental periods, that is, childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood. This may have had an impact on the pattern of results found, as ER processes develop and change from infancy to adulthood (Schäfer et al. 2016), with evidence of a maladaptive shift during adolescence between the ages 12 and 15 years [Cracco, Goossens, & Braet, 2017]. To clarify these mixed findings, it would be important to further study suppression in ASD.

Interestingly, studies reporting that individuals with ASD use adaptive strategies at a similar frequency as TD individuals have also found these individuals used more maladaptive strategies [i.e., Mazefsky et al., 2014; Samson, Hardan, Podell et al., 2015]. Furthermore, studies showing that individuals with ASD using the same amount of maladaptive strategies have also found individuals used fewer adaptive strategies. These findings suggest individuals with ASD consistently self-report or demonstrate an overall less adaptive pattern of ER strategy use [i.e., Rieffe et al., 2011; Rieffe et al., 2014; Samson, Hardan, Lee et al., 2015; Samson, Hardan, Podell et al., 2015; Samson, Wells et al., 2015]. One exception is the study by Pouw et al. [2013] where the ASD group of children and adolescents self-reported using similar amounts of both adaptive and maladaptive coping strategies when compared with a control group, even though they had significantly higher levels of self-reported depression symptoms. This finding contrasts with Rieffe et al. [2014] results using the same coping measure in a sample of participants of similar age range, which showed that the ASD group used less approach coping. One potential explanation for the unique findings reported by Pouw and colleagues might be the different gender distributions across studies. In a non-ASD sample, girls use more approach coping and less avoidant coping than boys [Eschenbeck, Kohlmann, & Lohaus, 2007]. Pouw et al. included only boys in their study whereas Rieffe et al. [2014] had a higher proportion of girls in the TD group (55% TD vs. 11% ASD), therefore the group differences found in Rieffe et al. may be due to gender effects. Future work using separate analyses for male and female participants might provide further clarification in terms of group differences in the use of approach and avoidant coping.

We would like to remind the reader that the adaptive and maladaptive categorizations of ER strategies as described above are based on findings in the non-ASD populations. In ASD, studies have consistently found higher use of certain strategies categorized as maladaptive and/or lower use of other strategies categorized as adaptive to be related to the presence and higher severity of internalizing and externalizing symptoms [Brugink et al., 2016; Mazefsky et al., 2014; Pouw et al., 2013; Rieffe et al., 2011; Rieffe et al., 2014; Samson, Hardan, Lee et al., 2015]. Among studies showing higher symptoms of internalizing and externalizing problems in ASD compared to the control groups, the ASD groups either reported less use of adaptive strategies and/or more use of maladaptive strategies. The only exception is the Pouw et al. [2013] study, which may be due to the gender distributions as already discussed. Therefore, based on the majority of research findings, it is likely that the use of ER strategies adaptive and maladaptive for individuals without ASD may similarly be adaptive and maladaptive for those with ASD.

There is one category of ER strategies that may have differing effects on the ASD population. ER research has found that the use of avoidant strategies was negatively associated with depression in youth with ASD [Pouw et al., 2013]. Furthermore, using a longitudinal design and the same measure used by Pouw et al. [i.e., the Coping Scale; Wright, Banerjee, Hoek, Rieffe, & Novin, 2010], Rieffe et al. [2014] found the increase of avoidant strategies contributed to fewer depressive symptoms in both ASD and TD children and adolescents. These observations are not in line with findings from the general population where avoidant strategies are typically characterized as maladaptive as they have been consistently shown to predict more depressive symptoms in TD youth [e.g., Herman-Stahl, Stemmler, & Petersen, 1995; Seiffge-Krenke & Klessinger, 2000]. Rieffe and colleagues suggested that measurement differences could have contributed to these unexpected findings, that is, the avoidant scale items used by Seiffge-Krenke and Klessinger were worded differently and measured different aspects of avoidant strategies. Specifically, Seiffge-Krenke and Klessinger’s items reflected less constructive avoidant strategy use whereas Rieffe et al.’s items referred to strategies that aimed to create more distance.

Based on the content analysis of the Coping Scale, we suggest the avoidant items (i.e., internalizing, externalizing, distraction, and trivializing subscales) encompass
both adaptive and maladaptive strategies. Distraction is seen as an adaptive ER strategy [see review by Joormann & Stanton, 2016] and trivializing may be considered as cognitive reappraisal (e.g., “I think it is not such a big problem” or “I tell myself that the problem is not very important”), since they downplay the emotional impact of the situation by rephrasing. Another possibility for the varying findings on the relationship between avoidant ER strategy use and depressive symptoms in TD and ASD youth that the use of avoidant strategies may be adaptive for youth with ASD, at least in the short- to medium-terms. It is difficult to determine the longer-term impact of using avoidance for individuals with ASD; therefore, further work is needed to determine the long-term adaptive value of avoidance coping in ASD.

Other research has shown relationships between ER and academic performance [Konstatareas & Stewart, 2006], social skills [Berkovits et al., 2017], peer social engagement [Jahromi, Bryce, & Swanson, 2013], social adjustment [Nader-Grosbois & Mazzone, 2014], and social anxiety [Swain, Scarpa, White, & Laugeson, 2015]. These findings are mostly consistent with findings in the non-ASD literature.

In the next section, we discuss limitations in the ASD literature relating to ER, including methodological and conceptual issues, and gender effects. In addition to the limitations in the current literature, we venture into research areas outside of ER and ASD to create foundations for a new fruitful avenue of research.

Limitations in the Current ASD Literature and Other Suggestions

One limitation in the ER research in ASD reviewed here is the use of instruments not originally designed to measure ER. From a methodological perspective, the type of measure used to assess ER sets the boundaries for the phenomenon under focus and thus influences the conceptualization of ER. Several research groups have used coping measures such as the Response to Stress Questionnaire [in Mazefsky et al., 2014], the Coping Scale [in Pouw et al., 2013; Rieffe et al., 2014], and the Cognitive ER Questionnaire [in Rieffe et al., 2011] to capture the construct of ER. Although coping is related to ER, there are conceptual distinctions: coping styles focus solely on dealing with stressful experiences, but ER strategies can be used in nonstressful situations to maintain or up-regulate positive emotions [Eisenberg, Fabes, & Guthrie, 1997; Gross & John, 2003]. Furthermore, Gross and John [2003] argued that coping styles incorporate a broader set of underlying processes that are not only emotion-related: for example, reinterpretation (a coping construct) not only measures reappraisal of the situation but also optimism and learning from experience.

In addition to the lack of conceptual clarity, there are a wide variety of ER assessment methods used, including different types of questionnaires, informant type (self vs. parent reports), or other assessment approaches such as interviews, diaries, and experimental designs. Additionally, there has been a minimal use of mixed-methods approaches in studying ER in ASD [but see Samson, Wells et al., 2015 for an example study]. A recent review of ER measurement in ASD by Weiss et al. [2014] found that 75% of studies included only one methodological approach to ER measurement, and even when more than one measure was used the approach was typically of the same type (e.g., two self-reports). A single-method approach increases the risk of common method variance contamination, especially in cross-sectional research [Lindell & Whitney, 2001]. Furthermore, the small number of ASD studies using an experimental design has generally focused on reappraisal only [Pitskel et al., 2014; Richey et al., 2015; Samson, Hardan, Podell et al., 2015]; other strategies that are important predictors of outcomes, such as acceptance of negative emotions and savoring of positive emotions, have not been examined. Therefore, future research investigating ER in individuals with ASD should leverage a wider variety of measures known to target ER processes.

Another observation worth noting is the gender effects in ER. In the general population, gender differences in ER strategy use have been reported [John & Gross 2004; Silk et al., 2003; Tamres, Janicki, & Helgeson, 2002]. One recent study reported that females engaged in more social support seeking strategies and dysfunctional rumination whilst males employed more passivity, avoidance, and suppression strategies [Zimmermann & Iwanski, 2014]. In ASD research, with the exception of two studies, most of the other studies focusing on ER had samples with mostly male participants (see Table 1), reflecting the increased prevalence of ASD in males. These gender distributions in ER are unlikely to influence the majority of comparative findings on strategy use between ASD and TD groups as most studies have used gender-matched groups. The only exception is the finding around approach and avoidant coping, as described in the previous section. However, it will be important in future research to determine if there are similar gender differences in ER strategy use between males and females with ASD as those found in the general population.

It has been found that the regulation of positive affect is as important as negative affect regulation in predicting wellbeing [Bryant, 2003; Gable et al., 2004; Quoidbach et al., 2010; Raes et al., 2012]. However, with the exception of two studies, there remains a lack of research on the up-regulation of emotions and regulation of positive affect in ASD. Samson et al. [2015]
found that both children and young adults with ASD experienced less amusement [in line with the results from other studies, see Samson, 2013, for a review], portrayed fewer attempts to regulate amusement, and were also less effective at regulating their positive emotions. A second study found that individuals with ASD had impaired ability to up-regulate positive emotions [Richey et al., 2015]. The Nucleus Accumbens is one of the key structures in the reward circuitry previously implicated as having a role in the conscious increase in positive affect [Grace, Floresco, Goto, & Lodge, 2007]. So far, no study has examined positive ER strategies in ASD, specifically savoring, positive rumination, and positive sharing, or examined the relationships of these strategies with internalizing and externalizing symptoms. A reduced use of strategies that promote positive affect in individuals with ASD, alone or in combination with the greater use of maladaptive strategies, and the absence/lower use of adaptive strategies to regulate negative affect, may lead to increased rates of psychopathology in this population. We propose that in order to fully understand the increased rates of psychopathology in this population, it is important to assess the impact of ER on short- and long-term mental health and life outcomes in ASD, it is important to assess the regulation of both positive and negative affect.

Although it is clear that co-occurring mental health problems are more frequent in ASD than in general population, it is currently less clear whether these problems in ASD, in particular anxiety and depression, are conceptually identical as in non-ASD population [Kerns & Kendall, 2012; Mazefsky et al., 2012; Ollendick & White, 2012]. It is important to disentangle whether the symptoms of anxiety and depression in ASD are: (1) a consequence of the same processes that underpin their development and maintenance in the general population (i.e., shared processes), (2) processes that might be unique to ASD such as, for example, impairments in understanding intentions and emotions in others (unique processes), or (3) a combination of both shared and unique processes. Both Mazefsky et al. [2012] and Rodgers et al. [2016] have observed a pronounced overlap between the symptoms of ASD and mental health conditions. For example, social avoidance, a common symptom of anxiety, can also be a manifestation of the ASD social impairment. Therefore, core ASD symptoms can be wrongly attributed to anxiety. The reverse can also occur; individuals with ASD often present with idiosyncratic mental health symptoms such as unusual specific phobias (e.g., vacuum cleaners, toilets) and fears of change or novelty [Kerns & Kendall, 2012; Uljarević et al., 2017], and these anxiety symptoms could be wrongly ascribed to core symptomatology, leading to missed anxiety diagnoses. Therefore, as Mazefsky et al. [2014] argued, in order to gain greater clarity about the role of ER in ASD, better understanding of how co-occurring mental health conditions should be conceptualized and assessed is also needed.

Finally, an important area of ER research in ASD is identifying factors that lead to emotion dysregulation. The extended process model of ER by Gross [2015] emphasizes the importance of emotional self-awareness, or alexithymia, which refers to difficulty in identifying and labeling one’s own emotions. Lane, Ahern, Schwartz, and Kasznia [1997] suggested alexithymia occurs when the environment triggers an emotional response and there is an impoverished conscious experience of the emotion. Alexithymia has been shown to be associated with poorer ER across normative populations and individuals with a range of psychiatric and neurodevelopmental conditions. For example, a neuroimaging study found that increased awareness of emotional state reduces emotional arousal [Herwig, Kaffenberger, Jäncke, & Brühl, 2010]. These findings suggest that poorer emotional self-awareness can lead to increased arousal, which can have negative long-term effects on mental health. This suggestion is supported by research in clinical populations showing that: (a) individuals with generalized anxiety disorder and lower levels of mindfulness had higher levels of ER difficulties [Roemer et al., 2009], and (b) individuals with schizophrenia displayed deficits identifying and describing emotions, and used less cognitive reappraisal and more suppression when compared to controls [Kimhy et al., 2012].

Overall, it has been argued that individuals with ASD show heterogeneity in emotional competence, and that the emotional impairments observed in ASD are due to alexithymia [Bird & Cook, 2013]. Reduced emotional self-awareness may present obstacles in the ability of individuals with ASD to understand and regulate difficult emotions and, as a consequence, impair psychosocial functioning [Hill, Berthoz, & Frith, 2004]. Empirical research indicates there are increased levels of alexithymia in ASD compared with TD individuals [Berthoz & Hill, 2005; Hill et al., 2004; Maisel et al., 2016; Rieffe, Terwogt, & Kotronopoulou, 2007; Rieffe et al., 2010; Samson et al., 2012; Tani et al., 2004], with the majority of these studies using the Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20; Bagby, Taylor, & Parker, 1994).

It has been argued that there are psychometric and conceptual issues associated with using the TAS-20, including the overlap between measures of negative affect and the TAS-20, as well as the validity of requesting individuals with emotional awareness difficulties to accurately report their ability to identify internal emotional states [Lane et al., 1997]. However, the use of questionnaires does not automatically equate to an invalid measurement of alexithymia, since the use of questionnaires that attempt to capture the individuals'
ability to be aware of emotions without self-appraisal can be useful and relevant. Measures such as the Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale (LEAS) developed by Lane, Quinlan, Schwartz, Walker, and Zeitlin [1990], which uses hypothetical scenarios and captures the emotional responses to these scenarios, are able to provide greater insight into individuals’ emotional awareness. Importantly, research using performance-based tasks has also found that individuals with ASD have difficulties identifying their own emotions [Rieffe et al., 2007].

Research has consistently shown a positive relationship between alexithymia and increased affective symptoms in ASD [Hill et al., 2004; Maisel et al., 2016; Rieffe et al., 2010]. However, only one study has examined the relationship between alexithymia and ER strategy use in ASD. Using the TAS-20, Samson et al. [2012] found that alexithymia does not account for differences observed in ER strategy use in ASD and TD samples; however, replication of these findings is required using a more valid measure of alexithymia such as the LEAS. Despite the high frequency of poor emotional self-awareness and its association with comorbid psychopathology in ASD, and evidence that poor emotional self-awareness is associated with problems in ER in non-ASD populations, the relationships between problems in emotional self-awareness, emotion dysregulation, and affective disorders in the ASD population have not been examined to date.

**Emotion Regulation Interaction and Flexibility: A New Approach in ASD**

Our objective in this section is to propose a framework that has previously been examined in non-ASD populations over the last few years, but one that is new to the ASD field. People have a repertoire of ER strategies that they can choose from to regulate their emotions, and this may result in two phenomena: (1) the use of maladaptive strategies may interact with adaptive strategies and this interaction may impact mental health outcomes; and (2) individuals have differing abilities to select strategies and implement them in context specific ways (i.e., to use ER strategies in a flexible manner). Indeed, Aldao and Nolen-Hoeksema [2012b] demonstrated the effect of interactions between adaptive and maladaptive strategy use on outcomes in a large community sample by creating two composite scores for ER strategy, one for adaptive strategies and the other for maladaptive strategies and running a stepwise regression. They found that adaptive strategies had a negative association with a range of psychopathology symptoms including anxiety, depression and alcohol problems, but only when levels of maladaptive strategies were elevated. This combined approach may have more explanatory power in unraveling the mechanisms of affective disorders in ASD. In general, people spontaneously use a number of different strategies in a given situation, even in situations of short duration [Aldao & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2013], and there is growing evidence that healthy adaptation involves the flexible use of strategies that are suitable for specific situational demands [Aldao & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2012a; Sheppes et al., 2014].

We suggest the ER strategy interactions as well as flexible strategy use are important aspects of ER in ASD. The interactions between ER strategies are likely to be related to the higher prevalence of psychopathology observed in ASD. Some studies in ASD have included both adaptive and maladaptive strategies in one model to examine shared variance in predicting outcome variables [e.g., Rieffe et al., 2014]. Due to the challenges of recruiting participants in clinical groups, most ER studies in ASD had relatively small sample sizes, which limit the capacity to achieve adequate power in interaction analyses. Findings from recent papers examining interactions between adaptive and maladaptive ER strategy use in ASD using approaches other than regression [Cai, Richdale, Dissanayake, & Uljarević, 2018a; Cai, Richdale, Foley, Trollor, & Uljarević, 2018b] suggest the higher use of an adaptive strategy might be a protective factor for psychological wellbeing in individuals who also highly use a maladaptive strategy. Future research can expand on the current findings by the detailed examination of how ER strategies interact using approaches such as the one used by Aldao and Nolen-Hoeksema [2012b] and assessing the effects of flexible strategy use that are context specific.

In a review encompassing work from diverse areas including ER, mindfulness, personality psychology, and neuropsychology, Kashdan and Rottenberg [2010] provide evidence for the importance of psychological flexibility in mental health. They found that the main feature of mood and anxiety disorders is a stereotyped way of responding to situations and proposed three key factors that impact psychological flexibility: executive functioning, default mental states, and personality configurations. Executive functions refer to a set of cognitive processes that guide thoughts and actions [Miyake & Friedman, 2012], including working memory, attention shifting, and response inhibition [McRae, Jacobs, Ray, John, & Gross, 2012]. Cognitive reappraisal has been found to be associated with attention shifting and working memory but not response inhibition [McRae et al., 2012], and high-ruminators have more difficulty switching between internal representations in working memory [Beckvé, Deroost, Koster, De Lissnyder, & De Raedt, 2014].
Individuals with ASD frequently have difficulties in executive functions, specifically attention shifting, flexibility, and planning [Ozonoff & Jensen, 1999; Rinehart, Bradshaw, Moss, Brereton, & Tonge, 2001]. While older studies have found response inhibition and working memory to be intact in ASD [e.g., Ozonoff & Jensen, 1999; Ozonoff & Strayer, 2001], a more recent review of research concluded that these executive function components are indeed impaired in this population, and compensatory mechanisms exist to allow normative functioning [O’Hearn, Asato, Ordaz, & Luna, 2008]. It is thus likely that individuals with ASD have problems regulating their emotions in a flexible manner due to attention-shifting and working memory problems, as these have been found to be associated with reappraisal and rumination [Beckwé et al., 2014; McRae et al., 2012]. However, despite the links between ER and executive functions shown in non-ASD populations, no research to date has explicitly assessed mechanisms underlying the interplay between executive function and emotion dysregulation in ASD. Some of the studies discussed above have controlled for cognitive abilities [e.g., Jahromi et al., 2012; Samson, Hardan, Podell et al., 2015]. However, as there are no strong correlations between intelligence quotient scores and executive functioning [Ardila, Pineda, & Rosselli, 2000; Welsh, Pennington, & Groisser, 1991], future studies on ER should also examine executive functions.

Below, we draw on neurological observations to propose a relationship between ER and executive functions. Firstly, the brain regions subserving cognitive reappraisal [dorsomedial, dorsolateral, ventrolateral regions of prefrontal cortex; Buhle et al., 2014; Diekhof, Geier, Falkai, & Gruber, 2011; Kalisch, 2009; Ochsner & Gross, 2005; Ochsner & Gross, 2008] and suppression [dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and dorsolateral, ventrolateral regions of prefrontal cortex; Goldin et al., 2007; see also Etkin, Büchler, & Gross, 2015] are activated during tasks tapping into attention, cognitive flexibility, response inhibition and working memory. These findings suggest that aspects of executive function and ER are supported by overlapping brain areas and networks [Logue & Gould, 2014]. Secondly, these regions show atypical patterns of activation in ASD across a range of executive function tasks [Minshew & Keller, 2010; Schmitz et al., 2006; Shafritz, Dichter, Baranek, & Belger, 2008; Kana, Keller, Minshew, & Just, 2007], which may explain the deficits in cognitive reappraisal observed in ASD. Finally, research has shown there is less connectivity between frontal regions and the lower limbic brain in individuals with ASD [Samson et al., 2016], and during tasks involving down-regulation of negative emotions, there is decreased engagement of prefrontal regions and lack of amygdala down-regulation in ASD [Pitskel et al., 2014; Richley et al., 2015]. It is apparent that these two separate streams of neurological research, one examining executive function and the other emotion regulation, are largely related. As the brain structures involved in both sets of functions are atypical in ASD, these two areas of research should be considered together in future research in order to tease apart mechanisms underlying executive and ER dysfunction in ASD. Such an approach may assist in determining the role of cognitive flexibility in ER in ASD.

Summary

Emotion dysregulation is common in individuals with ASD and is associated with a wide range of mental and physical health outcomes. This commentary highlights the role of emotion dysregulation in ASD and its relationship with psychopathology. We suggest the habitual use of ER strategies identified to be adaptive and maladaptive for individuals without ASD may play a similar role for those with ASD, however further work is needed to confirm this. We highlight conceptual and methodological limitations and propose new directions for investigating ER in ASD, incorporating knowledge from other literatures on the role of flexibility in healthy adaptation, connections between flexibility and executive function deficits, the adaptive value of up-regulation of positive emotions, and the importance of emotional self-awareness.

Emotion regulation research in ASD is in its early days, and there is a strong imperative to unravel the mechanisms underlying emotion dysregulation in ASD. Apart from directly examining the relationships between ER and internalizing and externalizing problems, we can also infer the role that ER plays in the maintenance of these problems by studying the changes in symptoms post interventions that target ER. Although ER intervention research in ASD is still in its infancy, preliminary results from recent pilot studies are encouraging and indicate that ER intervention approaches including cognitive behavior therapy [Scarpa & Reyes, 2011; Thomson, Riosa, & Weiss, 2015] and mindfulness-based intervention [Conner & White, 2017] are feasible and effective, and can improve emotional acceptance, impulse control, negative reactivity, and internalizing and externalizing symptoms in both children and young adults. Research in non-ASD populations has also demonstrated the efficacy of ER intervention in reducing symptoms of mental health disorders [e.g., see Mennin & Fresco, 2009]. Notably, Fernandez, Jazaieri, and Gross [2016] proposed that ER should be conceptualized as a separate domain in the Research Domain Criteria (RDoC) matrix [Insel et al., 2010], a dimensional framework developed for classifying...
mental disorders. It is important we continue to advance ER research in ASD through lessons learnt and ideas generated from research in other populations in order to develop evidence-based ER interventions for those with ASD to maximize their wellbeing.
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