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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript describes the hypothesis, study, and methods of an original research. The language, specifically the grammar, is of a discreet quality. So, I advise you to make a careful re-reading in order to correct some inaccuracies and to improve reading fluency.

This manuscript is oriented to assess the feasibility of a collaborative integrated model for universal screening, identification and treatment of clinical and sub-clinical mental disorder among Danish employees. It is a current and interesting theme and there is a need to study this issue, with particular regard to the workplace.

Abstract and keywords are discreet both in terms of appropriateness of context and the purpose of study.

The introduction (including its subsections) is well written and more than satisfactory in terms of appropriateness of context and the purpose of study. The length is adequate and the analysis of the literature can be improved, especially in view of the importance in the field of Occupational Health Psychology with particular attention to workplaces. In this way, I advise you to consider and also comment some recent publications on the topic. For example, I suggest you to refer to the following publications:


You could also consider a brief discussion regarding the potential additional effects of the economic crisis in the dynamics of workplace bullying. Indeed, new trends in the current period need to be addressed. It is a very current topic and I suggest you to refer to the following publications:


Methods section appears of a more than satisfactory quality. However, you should go deeper into this section and, in addition, explain better the reasons why you have chosen to use these research methods. This makes the whole paper more understandable to the readers. Add also any possible consideration about ethics statement in the Methods body text. The statistical methodologies that you have used are well illustrated.

Results section is, as a whole, of a more than satisfactory quality. However, you should better connect the text with tables. In other words, you should more thoroughly explain the contents of the three tables and the two figures before making reference to them in the body text. The quality of the two figures is not sufficient.

The discussion section, although methodologically correct and well written, is just enough. You should carefully compare your various findings with the field literature. I suggest you to go deeper into the study's limitations. Finally, I suggest you to use a final paragraph to sum up your findings. Otherwise, you should also carefully explain what is the specific contribution that your findings brings to literature and knowledge in this area.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

No

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

No

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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