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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.

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.

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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