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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for extending the opportunity to review a revised version of manuscript. While the authors have addressed the majority of my comments in their revision, I thought the response regarding the rationale to incorporate mindfulness into CBT (and other relevant evidence with regards to interventions that already incorporated mindfulness and CBT (e.g., MBCT)) could be more in-depth. For example, the revision seems to have missed out (or does not sufficiently acknowledge) quite a bit of literature that exists in support of the effects of MBCT in treating depression and other disorders (e.g., for one of the many reviews on the efficacy of MBCT, see Piet & Hougaard, 2011). Therefore I question the accuracy of the statement "but limited work has looked at mindfulness within the context of CBT (24,25)"). Further, I find the authors' response to Reviewer's query regarding the mindfulness qualification of the therapists who delivered the intervention (i.e., "Sessions were led by two staff psychiatrists who received training in CBT and mindfulness") to be unsatisfactory. More information about the type and extent of mindfulness and CBT training received by the therapists would enable a better evaluation of the efficacy and quality of the intervention as a whole.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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