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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to review this interesting paper. Overall the paper is well written. The aims of the paper are clearly set out i.e. to explore Norwegian GPs’ opinions on how the treatment of common mental disorders in primary care could be improved.

Overall I think this paper is of sufficient interest and quality to warrant publication though there is little surprising in the results. However, I think it needs to be revised before publication.

Minor amendments

1. The qualitative methodology needs to be described in a lot more detail e.g. who did the coding, how was the data coded, how were the themes verified, what was the theoretical framework used?

2. The background is unfocussed and should be made more relevant to the research. I would have thought it was more relevant to discuss work that has already tried to improve mental health outcomes in primary care here rather than a general discourse on the need to improve outcomes. (though I note this has been discusse in the dicussion)

3. In the discussion the authors state that within IAPT the treatment ‘will largely be group sessions using a cognitive behavioural framework’. This is not true. IAPT is dividing its services into low and high intensity treatment. Treatment is CBT based but not necessarily run in groups.

4. There are a number of typos: Page 7. I think the authors mean ‘cooperation’ rather than ‘corporation’; page 11 para 2 ‘ A model where the practitioner does….’; Page 12 para1 Samm ‘T’ after the colon; Page 13 last sentence ‘...but so are mental...’

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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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