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Reviewer’s report

Title:
Differing mental health practice among general practitioners, private psychiatrists and public psychiatrists

Version: 2 Date: 10 August 2005
Reviewer: Gavin Andrews

Reviewer’s report:
General: this study is a new approach and while the response rate varied and was less than optimal, the results are probably true. They are important and are adequately reported. Clearly, this part of France is of little interest to others, what is of interest is the method, a cheap postal questionnaire to define practice patterns. They should therefore publish the questionnaire as an attachment [in English please] so that readers can decide which question generated which response and researchers who wish can decide to repeat the survey in their own area. There are many surveys of the workload of private and public psychiatrists, and of GPs in other countries but not of all three together. The national surveys of population samples do provide some of these data from the consumers perspective but not the inter-relationship between professions.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) NIL

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) Add the questionnaire.

We have added the mental health practice questionnaire as an attachment in English. We mention that it is an English translation of the questionnaire used for data collection for the study and drafted by an English native speaker with experience in questionnaire translation and adaptation. In this form it is designed to provide information on the content of the French questionnaire used in the study, and may not be suitable without adaptation for use in another cultural and therapeutic context.
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore) As someone who is completely monolingual I am in awe of the polylingual abilities of the Europeans. This paper is comprehensible but would still benefit from an edit by a native speaker of English. Sorry.

An English native speaker has revised the whole article and have made several modifications which are difficult to signal point by point in the text

What next?:
Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest:
An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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