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Reviewer's report:

Major revisions:

Results

1. The first 3 paragraphs in the section ‘Framing the of the problem and its underlying factors’ appear to draw on findings from the preliminary reviews (as evidenced by citing of references) but the author prefaces this section as being results from the policy dialogue discussion. It needs to be made clearer for readers which findings came from which source: a) from the literature review, or b) from the policy dialogue discussions? This comment also applies to subsequent sections in Results.

2. An important aspect of knowledge translation is the timeliness of response, that is, time between stages of the KT process. An indication of time periods between the policy dialogue and some of the results from the post dialogue survey results would be informative, and also allow readers to make some assessment of whether survey results are actually an outcome of the KTP process, or just occurred in parallel. For instance, when (month & year) was the policy dialogue held? And then when, for instance, was the subsequent WHO mental health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP) workshop held (month & year) and the 20 million euro grant secured?

Minor revisions:

Abstract

1. In the Methods paragraph: the authors say “…..development of a policy brief to address the mental health problem”. You need to be more specific, do you mean “…..policy brief to address the lack of access to PHC for people with mental health issues”?

Background

2. In the second paragraph, give full acknowledgement of the definition for knowledge translation e.g. Straus and colleagues (2009) (Ref)

Methods

3. In section 2 ‘Development of Policy Brief’, the first sentence sounds nice but doesn’t tell us much. This info needs to be more specific, for instance WHAT
information was sought in the search? Was it a systematic search? If so, what were the inclusion and exclusion criteria?

4. Second paragraph, the sentence is confusing because of excessive punctuation.

5. Second paragraph: The authors mention that when systematic reviews were not available, meta-analyses were sought as well. Presumably any meta-analyses would include a systematic review therefore this actually falls within your primary category of study type.

References


7. The sentence “In addition, mental disorders are costly to national economies in terms of expenditure and loss of productivity” is referenced to 11. This is not an appropriate source, it appears there was a mix-up in citations?
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