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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports findings from a chart review of patients enrolling in a large, 4-session CBTm course administered in a university setting. The manuscript is well-written overall, and the findings are meaningful in that they provide data on the effectiveness and acceptability of a CBT course delivered in a real world setting. The analyses conducted were also rigorous, and I appreciate the fact that the authors analyzed the clinical significance of their findings. Below are a few suggestions to strengthen the manuscript as a whole:

* Even though the paper focuses on the evaluation of a CBT+mindfulness course, the introduction section did not provide any background information about the concept, practice, or evidence base related to mindfulness. Incorporating this information would help readers understand the rationale for delivering a course that integrates elements of CBT and mindfulness.

* On this note, did other studies that have evaluated the effects of large scale CBT courses also include elements of mindfulness in the course(s)? If so, how did the data of those studies compare to the findings of this study?

* In the methods section, include information about the study's inclusion and exclusion criteria in text, as opposed to in the figures section.

* Also, more information on how diagnosis was established would be helpful. Did the clinicians use any standardized tools to establish the diagnosis of patients enrolled in the study? If not, this should probably be noted as a limitation of the study.

* Minor note: Spell out GAD-7 and PHQ-9 fully at their first mention in text.

* It will also be helpful to provide more information on the modality of the course delivered. Was it primarily psychoeducational and didactic? To what extent was the course experiential? What were the types of mindfulness exercises taught in the course? Were participants given any homework in between sessions?
* As the authors noted, one of the key rationale for exploring the delivery of CBT in the format of large group courses is to reduce wait time for treatment. Can the authors provide more specific information with regards to the amount of wait time that can be reduced based on past research (or their own past research)?

* In the Discussion section, in "As Delgadillo and colleagues discuss", "discuss" should be written in a past tense.

* One of the notable findings of the study is that lower education and higher depression severity at baseline predict a greater likelihood of dropping out from the course. Given that this appears to be a trend from a review of past studies, can the authors provide more specific ideas / suggestions on how one might address this issue in future iteration of such courses?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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