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Author's response to reviews:

Dr Rachel Tolhurst
Journal Editorial Office
BioMed Central Editorial Team

14th July 2015

Dear Dr Tolhurst,

RE: MS: 1207182601129581, entitled "A mixed methods study of collaboration between perinatal and infant mental health clinicians and other service providers: Do they sit in silos?"

Thank you for your email dated 1st July 2015, suggesting revisions to the above manuscript.

We acknowledge and thank you for the opportunity to respond to the editor's and reviewer's comments. All feedback from both the editor and the reviewer have been incorporated. All changes are highlighted in red. We are happy to incorporate further comments should these be necessary.

Thank you for accepting this manuscript for publication in your journal.

Sincerely,

Karen Myors RN, RM, BHSci (Nurs), MN (Hons), IBCLC

Editor's and Reviewers' Comments to Author: Changes highlighted in red font

Editor:
1. Give the full names and affiliations of all the ethics committees that approved
the study.

ACTION: The following has been included under the Methods section of the manuscript:

Ethics approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committees of Sydney Local Health District and the University of Western Sydney.

2. Format Abstract section:

Please provide an abstract formatted according to the guidelines for authors

Abstract sections
- Background
- Methods
- Results
- Conclusions

ACTION: The manuscript abstract is currently formatted as per the guidelines for authors, please see below:

ABSTRACT

Background: Women at risk of poor perinatal mental health benefit from coordinated approaches to care. Perinatal and infant mental health (PIMH) services have been established to support women with social and emotional needs. This paper examines the nature and extent of collaboration within two PIMH services in Australia.

Methods: A convergent, embedded, mixed methods design was used. Two hundred and forty four medical records were reviewed, 13 professionals (six PIMH clinicians, two PIMH service managers, and five key stakeholders) and 11 women service-users participated in semi-structured interviews.

Results: Three broad themes were drawn from the data, Theme 1: We don’t sit in silos … but they do, Theme 2: We need to enhance communication, and Theme 3: Collaboration is hard work. Perinatal and infant mental health clinicians believe they work collaboratively with other service providers. Key stakeholders and documentation in the medical records reveal that collaboration is nominal.

Conclusions: Professionals believe that collaboration is essential for women with complex needs. Perinatal and infant mental health clinicians are skilled at building relationships with women, however further support is needed to build trusting relationships with other service providers. Women service-users also need to be involved in the collaborative process to become equal partners in their care.

Reviewer 1:
1. The authors have adequately addressed the comments in my previous review.

ACTION: Thank you, no action required.