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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

This is an important paper for those interested in analysing the mental health system in developing or middle income countries.

1. Methods:

A Qualitative content analysis should be explained and some reference to the process of coming up with what to include in the domains and sub domains. This should be in the methods section.

B How did the study identify relevant documents?

2. Results

A The section under Governance (1. Structure of health System in Vietnam) is confusing and difficult to understand. Perhaps a description of the mental health system would help with reference to the levels of provision as well as the staff available at each level. The levels in the system are under human resources (second paragraph) and there is more information under Provision (first paragraph). I think this would be more coherent if it was placed together.

B. The section on social capital (under Resources) is needing clarification as to what is meant in this study by the term "social capital". I think this would be helpful with each of the sub domains in this template. There are inevitably overlaps between sub sections of domains and I think spelling out how this study has defined them would be helpful to the reader (see above).

Discussion

There are two aspects of the discussion that are important and these should be made more explicit. 1 The process of completing the template and then the analysis of the adequacy of policy and provision. Both of these areas are addressed in this paper but I think the limitations of trying to conduct this assessment should be spelt out and how the template may be adapted if other countries are to use it. Then with the findings from the template I would think some statement about the value of the template in translating findings into practice and policy might be appropriate.

Discretionary revisions

1. In is uncommon practice to start a sentence with a numerical percentage. The
figure should be written in full. -eg Background paragraph 2 line 4 50% and throughout the manuscript

2. All Abbreviations - eg WHO CBMHP should be written in full in the first instance with the abbreviation in brackets. There are too many abbreviations - can the number be reduced for ease of reading and understanding.

3 Some paragraphs are confusing for those unfamiliar with the topic area.- see Background paragraph 2 line 2 and Under Results - Context - Public policy First sentence - What is the Law of healthcare - The reference does not tell me much? Under resources - financing - final paragraph

4 The reference list needs editing for consistency - eg use of capitals but I am sorry I am not familiar with the journal style. What is the reference (i)?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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