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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors:

Thank you for the opportunity to read your revised manuscript. The changes you have made since the last submission, in relation to the comments made by me and my fellow reviewers, have greatly improved the paper. The Introduction is much clearer, and you have explained the background and rationale for the present study. I am pleased to see that the Discussion now includes a much more balanced interpretation of your findings. I understand that you do not have any additional data to benchmark the outcomes against and you have included this in the Limitations. I noticed a few typos that need correcting (e.g. in the References), so I would recommend a final proof-read of the paper to resolve these. Also, in the Introduction you state:

"Evidence suggests that mindfulness-based interventions are effective in treating anxiety and depression (22) and perform comparably to CBT (23), but limited work has looked at mindfulness within the context of CBT." This is not strictly true if you consider there has been extensive work to develop and evaluate Mindfulness-based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT), which is a programme that teaches a combination of mindfulness and CBT skills. You may want to mention this, or just rephrase slightly to make it clearer what you mean. Other than these minor issues, I would be happy to recommend this paper for publication.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown? 
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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