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Reviewer's report:

This study provides important new knowledge in a field and for an age group in primary care where there is a need to know more to ensure quality. It is well written and has a design and method suitable for the objectives of the study.

I have some minor essential comments.

The most important comments is concerning the heading. I feel that it is too wide in relation to the purpose and content of the study. The heading does not reflect that the study takes user’s perspective, especially parent’s perspective. Other parts of the quality of the professional work with child and adolescent mental health in primary care, as e.g. to detect health problems among patients in this age group and to use evidence based treatments, are not included in the study. Perhaps two words to the current heading would fix this: ... “Parental perspective”. An additional minor comment is that it is a bit imprecise to use the term adolescents when the upper age is 15 years.

Although I think this is a well-written paper, I find that the Background section can be tightened up, including more accurate descriptions, e.g. supported by some figures. Are there figures on how many who attend GPs in this age group each year in the area where the study is performed (first sentence)? Also the third sentence can be supported by figures; Mauershofer’s study from 2009 I think is one relevant study.

The next sentences need to be more closely related to the theme in this study.

I have only a few comments to the Method part.

In the Figure (Flow Chart) – inserted after the first paragraph – the title is possible to get more precise and I miss specified figures of participants and groups from the second subsection and further down.

On page 9 first sentence i Phase 3: Delphi process: what is described as a two-stage modified Delphi I actually perceive to be a simplified more than modified process, compared to the original four-stage model, although I know that this simplified version is well accepted and widely used.

The Result part only refer Phase 3 (The Delphi process) and Phase 4 (the piloting). The GPS: CAMH table is a useful and clear summary of the results.

The Discussion part discuss the findings, limitations and clinical implications in
an adequate manner. However, I miss a discussion of the methodology used for the qualitative hypothesis formation and the Delphi study, with clear findings, combined in the same study.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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