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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a really nice paper on a topic that is highly relevant to the scope of the journal. It tackles some of the important methodological issues in the rumination literature and provides interesting and adequate alternatives to commonly used methods. I only have a few minor comments.

The wording of the second hypothesis of phase 2 is rather unclear. It is hypothesized that a high ratio of rumination to distraction/problem-solving would be associated with lower risk of depression. Shouldn't it be the reverse if the ratio is defined in this way?

Criteria for the imputation of missing values (fewer than 50% of items missing) could be more stringent.

More information should be given regarding the fit indices used in the CFA and, most importantly, the minimum level of fit required to consider a model as acceptable (CFI of .85 is still too low according to commonly used criteria). Also, it is unclear to which extent the comparison between four- and five-factor models has been performed using a statistical test (e.g., chisquare difference).

Page 18, paragraph 2: typo in unidimensionalty
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