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Author's response to reviews:

Dear reviewers and members of the editorial team,

Thank you for your feedback, which has helped us to improve our manuscript. Our responses are as follows:

Reply to Reviewer 1:

We have integrated all your minor revisions, and have the following responses to your comments:

• “Ability to judge” has been changed to “capacity to give informed consent.”
• Evaluative measures: We have clarified that compliance was measured at t2 as well.
• The fact that men take part in prevention programs less often than do women has more facets than what we are able to discuss. It would be interesting to see more work on this issue. The advertisements did not mention mental health in any way, and the message conveyed was overtly positive (a fact which we now mention in the Methods section), but maybe the message was perceived as too “touchy-feely” and was associated with weakness by some men.
• The book and the CD are not mandatory, although participants are encouraged to obtain them. However, we do not know how many actually did so.
• With respect to your comments on the last paragraph in the Discussion, we have deleted “male participants tended to be slightly less satisfied with the course”, since we earlier deleted the paragraph in the Results section on
nonsignificant tendencies.

Reply to Reviewer 2:

First, we would like to thank you for your concern about the language and grammar. The revised manuscript has been edited by a native English speaker. We agree with you that the introduction and discussion sections were too long, and have shortened both in accordance with the suggestions provided.

• We agree with you that wellness programs and primary mental health prevention programs are not necessarily the same thing, and have tried to make this clearer throughout the paper.

• We are aware of the scientifically important debate about the uncertain outcome of increasing protective factors and included a related passage in the background section.

• To acknowledge that data on the efficacy of mindfulness-based interventions on mental health and substance use outcomes are mixed and at the same time shorten the abstract, we have omitted the sentence about mindfulness interventions on clinical populations, and have added a recent meta-analysis on mindfulness with healthy adults.

• Unfortunately, we have no knowledge about the total number of eligible participants, as the courses are advertised publicly. As the ads are gender-balanced (e.g., both male and female images appear on the posters), we assume that there was no gender bias in the potentially eligible population.

• We have added Table 4 to show different aspects of participant feedback and to show that all mean scores were within the same range. In our view as intervention developers, the aspect of acceptance is often not given enough emphasis in papers. If removal of the table is recommended by the editors, we can instead summarize its content in the Methods section.

• We agree that the discussion contained too much detail on the results. We have now simply summarized the major results, and have removed the numbers where possible.

• Author conflicts of interest are now identified at the end.

We hope that you will consider our revised manuscript for publication.

Kind regards,

Lisa Lyssenko and Martin Bohus