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Author's response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:

We are grateful for the comments and suggestions regarding the article entitled Perceptions of Mexican Women regarding Barriers in Mental Health Services in Primary Care. We have responded to each of these below and attach a new version of the article.

Melanie L Straiton, PhD (Reviewer 2): The authors have done a good job with the revisions; the aim is clearer and the results and discussion fit better together. However, there are still some aspects that need to be addressed in the current draft in order to lead the reader logically through the study. The method in particular would benefit from restructuring it. The article also has some very short paragraphs - some of these could be put together. Also at times in the method and results, the participants are referred to as respondents. This makes them sound passive which goes against the nature of qualitative interviews where participants actively engage and shape the data collection. I'd advise changing all instances of respondents to participants.

Abstract: the categorisation of meaning approach is still confusing in this instance - Is this just thematic analysis? If so, please refer to it as this.

R: We accepted the reviewer’s suggestion and made the suggested change.

Introduction: P6, line 38 -institution should perhaps be avoided here as in terms of health care, it brings to mind inpatient services.

R: We changed the term “institution” to “health center”.

P8, line 40-46: characteristics of the health care provider are also important in the literature (as you also find).

R: We agree with your observation, and included the figure of the provider in the text.

P9, lines 18-24: references should be provided here - not just at the end of the paragraph.

R: We added the references to the paragraph mentioned.

P10, lines 16-23: this is written as if the results have already been presented. Plus, it doesn't really follow that there will be two types of knowledge from the article. Perhaps reword it (and combine with the paragraph above). e.g. This study seeks to identify…City. Updated information on barriers mental health care is important in light …PH. Further, we focus on the opinions of a group …conditions. Their care needs…

R: We agree with your observation and modified the text accordingly.

Methods: The first paragraph seems redundant - I'd suggest deleting it - perhaps also in the abstract too.

R: We deleted the paragraph suggested by the reviewer.

Participants: Focus here on the describing the sample. The first paragraph is part of the procedure.

Setting: It might be useful to have this prior to the participants section? Also mention which levels of centres you recruited from - or more simply for the reader - how many of the centres you recruited from had psychological services available?

R: We added the information that was required

Also, I find the use of 'module' a little confusing. Would service or unit be appropriate? Both here and other places in the paper.

R: We changed the term “module” to “service” for the sake of clarity

Techniques and instruments: Procedure might be a better title? Mention at the beginning of this section that it was part of a larger study (aim of the larger study) Line 33 - area explored in this article.

R: We made the modifications suggested by the reviewer to this section: we changed the title of this section; we indicated the objective of the broader study from which this work is derived.
Information analysis: Data analysis more appropriate?

R: We changed this to the term suggested by the reviewer

P 15, lines 16-46: this could either appear under a separate heading of ethical considerations or be included under the procedure section (except the last setting which may belong under data analysis.

R: We moved “Ethical considerations” to the section suggested by the reviewer.

Results: The first paragraph seems oddly placed as it is not part of the procedure. Does it fit better in the introduction or method section?

R: We decided to put it in the method section.

Unawareness of the Psychology Service: although the authors describe this theme as a system barrier, the name of this theme sounds more like an individual barrier - placing the onus on the women, instead of the poor distribution of information. Can you rename it to something more fitting?

R: This is in fact a systemic barrier, since in the health centers, there is very little information on mental health services (no brochures, posters or directories) and we chose this quote because it exemplifies this situation. In order to prevent this confusion, we renamed the barrier, “Limited information on the psychology service”.

Irregularity in consultations and inconvenient schedules: On their own, these stand as quite weak themes given the lack of interpretation - to me they are similar in that they both relate to the limited availability of services.

R: The interpretation that supports the establishment of this barrier was strengthened.

The privacy of personal problems: can this theme be developed more to include authors interpretations? Is it about maintaining the fasace of happy family life or is it about being self-reliant and the ability to cope themselves? Is there self-blame about their situation?

R: We expanded the information to make it easier to understand for both the reviewer and readers.

Mistrust of treatment: Social imaginary is a confusing

R: We expanded the information to make it easier to understand for both the reviewer and readers.
Characteristics and attitudes of the psychologists: I am not sure as to what point the authors are making here - the description focuses on characteristics but the quote indicates that is is only the attitude the woman reacted too.

R: Several of the respondents remarked on the negative attitudes of some psychologists during the sessions. These testimonials reflect the annoyance these attitudes cause in patients and may even discourage the continuity of their treatment.

Discussion: limitations should not come after the conclusion but incorporated into the discussion. It would also be interesting to see methodological reflections about the role of the researchers in relation to data analysis.

R: We incorporated the limitations into the discussion and added a methodological reflection to the data analysis section