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Reviewer’s report:

The topic of this work is an interesting point of view regarding the implementation of new technologies on the treatment of mild/moderate depression.

1) MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISION:

The methods is well described and formally appropriate but the analysis seem fragmented and the presentation of results do not contribute to clarify the main findings of meta-analysis. To overcome this imprecision it is possible to focus the statistical design on the comparison supported by adequate number of CCBT study reported in literature. This measure could contribute to ameliorate the powerful of analysis and above all it could prevent to “jump to conclusion” in the absence of sufficient amount of data (e.g. table 5-8). Also, the discussion need to be summarized emphasizing the main conclusion that should find different support in the several facets of the analysis. Moreover, the list of inclusion criteria could be refined through more specific and scientific terms while the list of exclusion criteria must be provided. A brief description of the inclusion studies should be provided.

From conceptual perspective, despite the subgroups analysis seems statistically adequate, the aggregation of TAU-individuals and waitlist-individuals in the same control groups appears inconsistent. The authors tried to elucidate the rationale of this aggregation but it appears partially sufficient.

2) MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISION:

The authors delineate the topic of their research but it seems necessary to focus the limitations of previous data (e.g the list on page 2-3 appears uneven) in order to obtain a concise description of the premises and potential of such meta-analysis. Moreover, in the background section it appears reasonable to update the references “AHCPR, 1999” which is reported as recent finding. Lastly, table 2 should be the first placed in the presentation of results.
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