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**Reviewer's report:**

This article is interesting and pertinent, but major revisions should be made.

Abstract (overall, the Abstract needs to be substantially rewritten for better clarity):

- The first paragraph of the abstract, in particular, is not clear, and needs to be rewritten.

- The objectives of the study need to be more clearly stated, and should be removed from the method section.

- The results are also not clearly presented, and recommendations should be better specified among the conclusions.

Introduction:

- The objectives of this article are not clear. As well, a number of measures were studied, but they are not introduced appropriately in the introduction (e.g., access to care).

- More contextual information should be provided on the importance of improving the GP role in mental health.

- The nature of the links among "burnout, job satisfaction and psychological well-being" of GP, and other measures relating to the effectiveness of their role in mental health should be more clearly described. In addition, all the variables studied needed to be linked within a coherent framework. A figure showing all the outcome variables studied could perhaps be added, and appropriately presented in the methods or introduction section.

- I believe that this study was conducted in a collaborative care context, but this is not quite clear. The underlying model should be adequately introduced, with a description of the intervention studied.
- A better contextualization of the GP role in mental health, and major problems identified in the literature should be provided, including relevant statistics (e.g. % of GP burnout, levels of job satisfaction, with a better description of these issues…)

- A better literature review needs to be provided as well, including a review of other interventions that may improve GP work in mental health, and how the proposed intervention differs from previous experience. Much of the information provided in the introduction is, in fact, rather vague.

- The originality of the study should also be more clearly pinpointed.

- The last paragraph of the introduction is particularly unclear (one sentence has no verb), and should be rewritten. The objectives of the study should be very clearly stated.

Method:

- More information on the study context should be provided for international readers. What ambulatory mental health services were studied, and how were they related with the overall health care system (or what was the importance of the organizations studied in relation to the healthcare system)?

- Statistics were provided on the inhabitants covered by the primary care units studied, but how representative was this population compared with other populations treated by GPs at the national or state levels?

- This section should be more fully integrated, i.e. variables studied needed to be linked within a coherent, integrated analytical framework. This section could also be shortened, and the specifics of the instruments used presented in a table (and introduced very briefly in the text).

- The intervention design should be presented at the beginning of the methods section before introducing the outcome variables (and instruments). This section needs also to be more detailed and more clearly written.

- I would remove from the text the point that the study did not receive any funding, as this is already mentioned under "Funding" following the article.

Results/discussion:

- Please introduce the % response rate clearly in your article.

- Percentage of sessions attended by clinical psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers are reported. The attendance rate for social workers (65%) was particularly low, especially since
only one session was offered. It would be important to comment on these statistics in the discussion, as well as the potential impact of these results.

- The discussion points should also be reinforced with better linkage to the literature.

- There is no conclusion. The article needs to conclude with a statement regarding the originality of the study, and presentation of the key results. Concluding with a description of what was presented as "Future Research and Development" is, in my view, inappropriate.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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