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Reviewer's report:

The authors were very responsive to my original suggestions, and I think the revised manuscript is much clearer. I think the manuscript can make a significant contribution to the field.

There are still a few minor issues with the manuscript that I enumerated below. This list is not exhaustive, so I invite the authors to read the paper carefully to make sure grammar is fine, and that sentences are clear and statements presented throughout are accurate. Hope this list is helpful.

Abstract:

* Under the results "MBCT was significantly more efficacious than control only in patients with 3 or more previous depressive episodes and maintenance antidepressant medication". The way the sentence is structured makes this sentence slightly difficult to understand. Over which condition exactly was MBCT more significantly more efficacious?

* Conclusion "the effects of MBCT was under the influence of number of prior.." should be "was moderated by the number of prior"

Introduction

* Page 3, please provide a reference for "MBCT" the very first time it is mentioned in lines 50-51. (e.g., Segal et al. 2002/2012).

* Page 4, line 2 "MBCT might failed to reduce" should be "might fail to reduce"

* Page 4, lines 22 "another category of depression might be associated with rumination, namely patients with higher number of previous episodes" did you mean "another category of depression might be associated with heightened rumination, namely among patients with a higher number of previous episodes"
Results

* Page 6, line 45. Try not to start the sentence with a number written numerically (e.g., "180"). Instead try "Patients (n=180) with three or more previous…"

* Page 6, line 51-52 "because the control arm was manualized psychoeducation, was did not met our" should be "did not meet our".

Discussion

* Page 10, lines 39-40 "In other words, MBCT was considered to be less helpful than control for MDD patients with 2 or less previous episodes" Is this what was found? It sounds what you fund was that MBCT was not significantly different than the control condition among people with 2 or less previous episodes (at least this is judging from your results section, as well as the sentence that just proceeds this one).

* Page 10 lines 45-47 "however, for MBCT, the only one comparison from one trial did not show a positive effect at two years follow-up". That was never the intention of the authors (Kuyken at al. 2015). This was a non-inferiority trial, meaning they were hoping to show that MBCT and m-ADM were not significantly different from each other after 2 years in terms of relapse/recurrence. That is, MBCT can be thought of as an alternative to m-ADM.
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