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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are major issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are major issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is an interesting study and results are interesting. Overall, this investigation has the potential to contribute to the existing literature, particularly in relation to women's participation in community-based psychosocial support groups. However, the lack of a clear theoretical rationale, which is linked directly to the objective and integration of relevant literature, reduce the potential impact of this manuscript.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The aim of the study is too generic. It is not clear to me how the objective of the study was derived from theory or are logically connected to previous data and argumentation. Moreover, it is not clear to me the main focus of the study. Are (1) the factors influencing psychosocial support group participation or (2) the factors influencing restrictions on women's freedom of movement. Figure 1 is about the factors influencing restrictions on women's freedom of movement.

One of the major problems is that the article does not offer enough information to warrant publication.

It is well-known that the quality of an answer depends significantly on the quality of the question. Information about the questions posed to participants in focus group discussions and key informant interviews is missing. What are the questions and how they were chosen?

Any limitations of the data were not mentioned (such as non-response, refusal to take part).

What was the criteria for achieving an appropriate sample size?

How the research was explained to participants?

How desirability bias may have affected the findings?

Please provide information about inter-rater reliability.

Concerning triangulation, it is not clear to me how did you compare information to determine corroboration.
The limitations of the research were not fully acknowledged. For instance, the transferability to other contexts is not granted given the use of a convenience sample. Most important, data were gathered from women who already knew the team members of a host organization. What about the perspective of women who do not attend PSSGs? I think you probably would have achieved different results by including other participants.

It is not clear to me how dependability and confirmability was addressed by reflexivity journals, audio recordings, and notes on research process.

Most of the Discussion section is about the issue of restrictions on women's freedom of movement. Other factors affecting PSSG participation were not appropriately discussed.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.
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.
Not relevant to this manuscript

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