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Title: A "Grantathon" Model to Mentor New Investigators in Psychiatric Research

In the manuscript "A "Grantathon" Model to Mentor New Investigators in Psychiatric Research", the authors provide a commentary on the feasibility of a "grantathon" model of psychiatric research training for low-resource areas such as LMICs. This represents a novel description of a quick, relatively feasible, and effective model for training healthcare professionals in research project planning and grant proposal writing. The authors are commended for their undertaking of this important effort to build research capacity in LMICs. A few comments and suggestions to enhance the clarity of the commentary.

Abstract

* No comments

Background

* Page 3, line 39 - might want to cite the WHO agenda if there is a specific one being referenced.

* Page 4, paragraph beginning at line 34 - This section is a disjointed. It would be beneficial to restructure the paragraph to first present the prevalences and the prospective increase in disease and then discuss treatment to enhance clarity.

* Page 5, line 6 - May explain more about how these community based services have reduced use of inpatient mental health, provide statistic, etc.
Throughout - Be consistent with use of psychiatric v. mental health research; as well as whether it is general psychiatric research of specifically psychiatric service research.

Methods

* Participant Recruitment and Selection, page 7, line 29: might want to state upfront (i.e., in the first or second sentence of this section) that participants needed to apply and be accepted for the program.

* Participant Recruitment and Selection: It would be helpful to have a sense of the previous level of research support of the participants. Where these individuals who have obtained funding in the past or naïve to the grant submission process?

* State where the training was located and the cost to participants?

* Page 9, line 38 - Use the abbreviation NMHP as its already been referenced multiple times.

* Program Evaluation, page 9, line 53 - Potentially add a title to these: e.g., Perceived Ability; ICMR Funding; Participant Collaboration; also could be clearer about the actual outcome for 2 and 3, e.g., number of submitted proposals by 30 days, number of participant collaborations after the workshop.

Results

* Page 10, line 35 - Make it a bit more clear how to interpret this finding, is it referring to significant within participant improvements?

Discussion

* Page 11, line 11 - Have any of these types of projects reported on their process or evaluated their models? If so, would be helpful to cite examples. If not, or if it has never been done in this setting/ topic, then should be stated that this is a first commentary and evaluation of a project of this kind.
* What capacity do the mentors take in the funded proposals in respect to the grantathon model? Are they still involved or were they mostly there to facilitate grant writing and planning of the projects? Another relevant outcome then might be the level of involvement and participation (beyond just continued communication) between the mentors and the participants related to their funded proposals.

* Although not a limitation to this project, not all efforts to implement this model will have funding agencies to allow funding of projects. Maybe address how this was a strength of the current project and how it might be a limitation to implementation particularly of future "grantathons".

* Do the authors plan to continue monitoring the participant's research progress over the years? It would be interesting to know, not only whether participants continue to communicate, but also the degree to which they communicate (and hopefully collaborate) with their mentors and other participants, as well as whether the initial funding obtained leads to other successful finding opportunities.

Tables/Figures

* Table 1: Session numbers appear to be incorrect (no session 3 or 5). Also might want to collapse session 7 and 8 as it was in session 4 (e.g., include recap and review and evaluation Framework in day three am) in order to be consistent throughout.

* Table 3: Label Paired T-Test for the p-values; standard deviations only need to have two decimal places; and may want to include more significant figures/label the p-values as <.05 or <.01, etc. where they are presented as ".000".
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