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Reviewer’s report:

This paper presents the results from a pilot trial of the effectiveness of a primary care group CBT intervention for women with depression (defined as >9 on the PHQ-9). The aim of the study is also to present experiences of the implementation which could be important for future efforts of conducting randomised controlled trials in primary care. The authors report indications that the intervention is effective and conclude that a future RCT is feasible. The topic is of interest both to psychotherapy researchers and to clinicians willing to implement CBT in primary care. I recommend that this publication is accepted for publication after considering the revisions suggested below:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. The baseline measures and the 3 and 6 months measures should be in the same table so that the reader can compare the results between groups and time points more easily.
2. The statistical tests described as "descriptive statistics" (p10) need to be defined, e.g. as t-tests and chi-square tests.
3. The measure of anxiety symptoms is referred to as "Beck Anxiety Scale" (p6). This measure is properly called "Beck Anxiety Inventory". The authors should spell out Beck Anxiety Inventory or BAI in the text and the tables.
4. A mean on about 45 on the BAI indicates high anxiety levels in the participants. The authors should comment on this and I'd like to see a discussion on whether the participants really presented depression as their primary problem.

Minor Revisions:
1. Some double spaces are left in the text and should be removed.
2. The reference list contains some errors, e.g. missing or unnecessary spaces, inconsistency of reporting issues as NN(n) or only NN, double spaces between reference 12 and 13, underlining in reference 21.

Discretionary Revisions:
1. Reporting of effect sizes (e.g. Cohen's d) would make the results easier to interpret.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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