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Reviewer’s report:

Melissa Harper, Consultant at WHO Department of mental health and substance abuse, also contributed to this report as a reviewer of this paper.

This is an excellent paper. Overall the writing is clear and acceptable. The title and abstract accurately reflect the content discussed and the results. The questions posed by the authors are new and well defined and the approach using KT is a pioneering approach in literature covering mental health systems in Arab countries. The methods are appropriate and well described, the attached policy brief is well written and there are sufficient details provided to replicate the work in other low and middle income countries. The data are sound and figures appear genuine and logic. This was evident in documenting the discussions of stakeholders following the policy brief presentation. The manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting.

Please consider the following revisions:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

To elaborate more on limitations of the study e.g. other factors that had possibly contributed to the positive change that the authors noticed regarding policy makers following presenting the policy briefs

Another key limitation was the absence of service user or their representatives from the stakeholders group consulted

Minor Essential Revisions:

To provide briefly some data in a paragraph describing the mental health system in Lebanon.

Was policy changed about whether PHC staff can now prescribe the meds that have been added to the NEML?

P5 - 6 pre-2014, what was the situation? No plan/policy at all? A couple of lines would be helpful here.

P6 – tenses (present then past) is it that regular priority setting was happening pre-2014 or was this a result of the K2P only?

I think the 2nd para in “The case of mental health in Lebanon” section should come first...to read more like a journey.

P8 - Search strategy, second step: Are you confident that Health Systems Evidence, Cochrane and the Database of SUPPORT summaries would capture
all evidence (including single studies)...why not use MEDLINE here too?
P8 - You mention quality checking of the retrieved studies...you have not mentioned what the quality of the body of evidence was.
You mention findings were summarized - how? Was there a particular qualitative research methodology used?
P14 - Diagnosis: add a line on identification of cases, given there will be no screening.
P16 – why only 9 participants? (I see this is covered in limitations, but a sentence on p9 would be good.
Discretionary Revisions :
To add a table providing more descriptions on the policy makers group consulted.
P9 - Political litmus tests: Add a line to explain the concept applied to health policy making (what is the McMasters test and how the test used here differed from it).

Level of interest:An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English:Acceptable

Statistical review:No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.