Reviewer’s report

Title: An integrative review on methodological considerations in mental health research – design, sampling, data collection procedure and quality assurance

Version: 0 Date: 14 May 2019

Reviewer: Guido Van Hal

Reviewer’s report:

This review adds important information on the methodology (that can be) used in mental health research. A lot of specific terminology is used in the manuscript but the authors explain this very well. The use of a data extraction form is very good, as is the use of the PRISMA procedure. However, one of the main problems is the English language. I really thought I was not the reviewer but the proofreader of the manuscript. I have seldom seen a submitted manuscript using such sloppy language. Moreover, the Discussion section consists of six pages mainly repeating the Results section. Please make this much more concise and reduce this to one and a half page, giving a critical view on what you found in your review.

One sentence was not clear to me, page 16, lines 3-4: ‘...sending different interviewers can make participants more comfortable, so as to increase the response rate.’ Do the authors mean that the respondent can choose between different interviewers to make a choice for the interviewer he feels most comfortable with? If so, how could this be done in practice? If you mean something else, please explain.

Please also pay attention to the References. I think the Arch Public Health wants the names of the referenced Journals abbreviated. Now, some Journals names are abbreviated and others are not.
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