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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript is innovative, exploring the relationship between metacognition and mindfulness. I would suggest the authors considering the following comments before submitting the manuscript for publication.

1. The authors attempt to draw linkage of the present study to psychological theory of emotional disorders, and theory of psychological treatments. However, whether it can contribute to theory of treatment remains unclear, with the limitation of the existing study design.

2. The theory for mindfulness-based therapies is not clearly illustrated. In fact, I do not think there is an existing psychological theory can offer good explanation to the mechanism of mindfulness. However, p.4 line 72, “emotional disorders are thus understood as a lack of mindfulness skills in the mindfulness-based approach” can be misleading. It would be much better to explain that mindfulness can be useful in managing cognitive vulnerability and reduce the chance of relapse in major depression (Segal, Williams, and Teasdale, 2013).

3. Although FFMQ has been identified as the mindfulness elf-reported scale with best psychometric properties there are many criticisms about the scale (e.g. Van Dam, Hobkirk, Danoff-Burg and Earleywine, 2012). FFMQ’s relationship with psychological disorders and treatment outcomes are inconsistent so I doubt the study aim can be achieved, using FFMQ.

4. For FFMQ, the inconsistency in the labels of subscales should be handled carefully.

5. P.10 line 226, ten percent... line 231, eleven percent...use of exact figures are recommended.

6. As the results suggested FFMQ is a fairly weak predictor of three types of emotional symptoms, I wonder if the objectives of the study can be meet.

I expect the authors can respond to comments 2, 3 and 6 as without a major revisions, the study aim cannot be reached.
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