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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review the revised version of this protocol.

The authors have tried to address the comments. However, the revision has made this protocol to be open for more critics. I personally liked the idea of narrowing down the perspective of the previous version of the systematic review protocol to the low and middle-income countries. As there is not so much evidence specifically to low and middle-income countries (LMIC), it would have been an important piece of evidence. The need of the review was well-justified. Changing the scope because of the reviewers' questions was not helpful. Anyway, the authors decided to widen the scope of it. As a systematic review author, it is always helpful to balance the scope of a review and the strength of evidence the systematic reviewers would like to generate. The authors are can decide where to focus.

If the authors decide to continue with the current scope, I suggest working on the following comments.

The introduction section particularly paragraph 1, 2, 3 are repetitive. There is an over the description of the global burden of major psychiatric disorders and its sequel. Synthesizing and summarizing the existing evidence is needed to have a clearer and informative overview of the problem on the global scale. Collect all the statements which talk about the same idea and synthesize their ideas along with their citations. The write up could be improved that way.

Proofreading with native English language speaker is essential for this protocol. In many sections of the protocol, there are outstanding English language issues that should be corrected.

As this protocol is now having a wider scope than it has from its previous form, it is also important to tailor the introduction. There are still statements in the introduction which talks about the burden of psychiatric disorders in LMIC.
In my previous comment, I mentioned about the assessment of publication bias. The authors prefer only funnel plot for publication bias. I suggest considering additional statistical strategies to check publication bias using statistical tests such as Egger test and Begg test.

I checked what the authors wrote in the PROSPERO database "We will check potential publication bias by visual inspection of the funnel plot. Besides, Egger's regression test will be used to statistically check the asymmetry of the funnel plot. Publication bias will be assumed with a P value of less than 0.10". This was right explanation to assess publication bias.

As the protocol is already registered in PROSPERO database, make sure to update the scope of it in the PROSPERO database based on the latest scope of the protocol if the authors would like to continue the protocol on its current scope. In addition, there are other issues requiring an update in the PROSPERO eg AMSTAR needs to be replaced with a relevant quality assessment method.

The methodological quality assessment tool is not appropriate. The ones cited are systematic reviews on methodological quality assessment tools. Please find a relevant tool and justify your choice. In addition, write the main domains of the quality rating scale in the quality assessment section.

On page 6 line 6 to 7, the authors wrote: "The following steps will be used sequentially in order to select quality studies for the systematic review and meta-analysis”. Mention the main domains of the quality assessment tool. The authors are not clear with quality assessment of studies. The steps subsequently described are about the study selection process. While those steps are important for study selection, it is not possible to rate the quality of a study using these steps described.

Most of the stages of systematic review can be automated using relevant tools such as Rayyan mainly helpful for screening, Covidence helpful for many stages of the review process. For more information to learn about more helpful tools, please consult systematic review toolbox webpages (http://systematicreviewtools.com/).
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