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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (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?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

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

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

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?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The author(s) have answered the recommendations set out in the first expertise. The authors have addressed my comments properly except for the one: "One of the major problems is that the article does not offer enough information to warrant publication". It seems to me that they misread the comment. I asked for more information (e.g., FGD guides) and indeed the author(s) provided more information. The author(s) have done a great job improving the writing to make the paper clearer. I congratulate them for their work.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Though author(s) are very clear and thorough about the Introduction, they do not make a strong case for why this study is important to this field though. The Introduction section is about depression, gender inequality and building CMH Competence. These topics are important, but they are not the study's objective. If the study's objective is about the factors influencing women's participation in psychosocial support groups, the author(s) should provide an Introduction that focuses on a) what we already know from the factors influencing factors influencing women's participation in psychosocial support groups, and b) what new concepts and empirical evidence this study can address that make a distinct contribution beyond the prior studies. In this way, the Introduction leads clearly and directly to the study's objective.

I read that this study was part of an evaluation and was therefore practical. However, this study, as it stands at the moment, is not an evaluation of a project or an intervention. Again, if the study's objective is about the factors influencing women's participation in psychosocial support groups, this has both theoretical and practical implications. The lack of a clear theoretical rationale addressing the factors influencing women's participation in psychosocial support groups reduces the potential impact of this manuscript.

It reads "few studies have examined the contribution of PSSGs for women in the Indian context". This study did not examine the contribution of PSSGs for women in the Indian context.

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.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable
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