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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)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

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

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

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

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

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: The study appears to have an improved introduction and discussion section, however, evaluating the revised paper is difficult because a letter outlining the revision was not provided, nor were any revisions highlighted within the manuscript. My overall impression of the study is that it identifies a large problem within the Kenyan county under study as it has no established policies or procedures to care for the mentally ill. The introduction appears to have an improved literature review and the discussion identifies some areas for improvement for the county. There are still large problems with the manuscript in regard to methods. There still is a lack of adequate information and references about the WHO AIMS measure (e.g. references, psychometrics, reliability, validity, literature using the measure) and the description of sample items is still lacking. The authors provide very little information about the participants (e.g. demographics, how they accessed them for interviews). There is very little information in regard to analysis. Interview procedures are not identified, nor are there any references or procedures listed for the qualitative content analysis for the records and quantitative data they collected. Lastly, the discussion still lacks a clear call for action for the county. The authors provide a list of action items - but I think these should be more prominently displayed and made a central component of the discussion.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

There continue to be problems with the manuscript that prevent it from being suitable for publication. As mentioned, there needs to be a much better methods section that: (1) better identifies psychometrics of the WHO Aims measure; (2) provides information on the sample and how they were accessed; and (3) identifies specific interview and analysis procedures with appropriate references. Second, the discussion still needs to be further revised that better highlights and expands upon the areas and steps needed for improvement identified by the authors. This should be the centerpiece of the article. Lastly, the title remains unacceptable. It needs to be shortened and refined.

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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