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Title: General practitioners' opinions on how to improve treatment of mental disorders in primary health care. Interviews with one hundred Norwegian general practitioners.

Version: 2 Date: 22 December 2009

Reviewer: Lynda Tait

Reviewer's report:
The authors’ revisions have strengthened the manuscript.

Reviewer's comment:
Major Compulsory Revisions
Page 7, Para 3: The authors cite a research methods book on focus groups (Ref#22). However, as this was not a focus group study the citation is not relevant. A book on content analysis would be more appropriate. For example, Neuendorf KA. The content analysis guidebook. Sage Publications, 2002.

Action taken:
The reference has been changed according to reviewers’ suggestion.

Reviewer's comment:
Minor Essential Revisions
There are several typographical errors remaining throughout the manuscript.
Page 6, Para 2: “The data presented in this paper [is] based” suggest change to ‘are based’.
Page 7, Para 2, last sentence: ”This was sent the GPs” suggest change to ‘this was sent to the GPs’.
Page 7, Para 3, 3rd sentence: The remaining were asked… Amend to either The remainder were asked, or The remaining GPs were asked.
Page 8, Para 2: “further specification of categories two of them”. Suggest change to: further specification of two of the categories.
Page 9, Para 1: ‘The majority of the GPs’ suggestions emphasised needs for improvement in secondary health care (…) where need… Suggest removal of ‘where’. Also end of this sentence, “where called for” could be removed so that
the sentence reads better.
Page 9, Para 2: final sentence: “Psychologist” Suggested change to Psychologists.
Page 10, Para 2: “diagnose” Suggested change to diagnosis.
Page 14, Para 2: “somatic health problems compared to for MH problems” Suggested removal of ‘for’.
Page 15, Para 2: “inflict large costs and this need” Suggest change to needs.
Page 16, Para 1: “coding is also strength” Suggest change to coding is also a strength.

Action taken:
All typographical errors pointed out by the reviewer have now been corrected.

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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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Reviewer's report

Title: General practitioners' opinions on how to improve treatment of mental disorders in primary health care. Interviews with one hundred Norwegian general practitioners.

Version: 2 Date: 23 December 2009
Reviewer: Paul Walters

Reviewer's report:
Thank you for asking me to re-review this paper. The points raised have been adequately addressed by the authors.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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