Peer Review Report

Review Report on Implementation of the Community Component of the Mental Health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP): A Scoping Review

Review, Public Health Rev.

Reviewer: Helena Velez-Botero
Submitted on: 12 Dec 2024
Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2025.1607759

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main theme of the review.**

The review focuses on the implementation of the community component of the WHO's Mental Health Gap Action Program (mhGAP). It examines the need for this program and identifies key variables influencing its implementation, such as strategy availability, cultural adaptation, training, and sustainability. The review highlights the program's potential to address mental health care gaps in low- and middle-income countries, emphasizing community-based and culturally sensitive approaches.

Q 2 **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

Strengths:
Rigorous methodological framework.
Comprehensive scope covering implementation variables and the significance of cultural adaptation.
Focus on low-resource settings with actionable insights for policymakers and practitioners.

Limitations:
Limited number of studies (only five met the inclusion criteria).
Over-reliance on narrative synthesis rather than quantitative metrics.
Minimal discussion of challenges in translating findings to policy or practice.

Q 3 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.**

Major Comments:
Strengthen the discussion section by including more practical implications and recommendations for policymakers.
The methodology section is comprehensive, referencing established frameworks. This adds credibility, but a more detailed explanation of the inclusion/exclusion criteria rationale would be helpful.
Provide additional context on why only five studies met the inclusion criteria. Address potential biases or gaps in the search strategy.
The manuscript could benefit from a more critical perspective on the mhGAP strategy itself. For instance, acknowledging and analyzing potential weaknesses or challenges in how the strategy is designed or implemented could provide a more balanced view. This could include discussing difficulties such as limited scalability, cultural misalignment, or resistance from communities or professionals to adopting the program's approaches.
Elaborate on the scalability of findings to other low-resource settings.

Minor Comments:
The abstract provides a concise summary, but it might be enhanced by briefly highlighting specific outcomes or implications for future research.
Improve the clarity of figure captions to make them self-explanatory.

The discussion effectively synthesizes findings but could elaborate on the practical implications of the community mhGAP implementation for policymakers and practitioners.
While the paper touches on the cultural and contextual adaptation, expanding this discussion with concrete examples or comparisons might strengthen the argument
Avoid overusing passive voice to enhance readability.
Ensure consistent formatting in the reference list.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?**

Yes, the reference list adequately covers relevant literature, including key studies on mhGAP and global mental health strategies.

Q 5 **Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)**

Yes.

Q 6 **Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner**

Yes.

Q 7 **Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?**

No.

Q 8 **Does the review have international or global implications?**

Yes, the focus on mhGAP implementation in low- and middle-income countries highlights its global relevance.

Q 9 **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

Yes, the title clearly reflects the content and purpose of the review.

Q 10 **Are the keywords appropriate?**

Yes, the keywords are relevant and accurately represent the scope of the review.

Q 11 **Is the English language of sufficient quality?**

Yes, the English language in the manuscript is of generally high quality, but there are minor areas that could be improved for clarity and flow. For instance:

Overuse of Passive Voice:
Current text: "The search was carried out between the years 2008 and 2024, given that in 2008 mhGAP began to be implemented in the world."
Suggested revision: "We conducted the search between 2008 and 2024, as mhGAP implementation began globally in 2008."
This change makes the sentence more active and engaging.

Repetition in Sentence Structure:
Current text: "The objective of mhGAP is to strengthen the real participation of national and local authorities in terms of the allocation of economic and professional resources to expand the coverage of evidence-based mental health interventions."
Suggested revision: "mhGAP aims to enhance the participation of national and local authorities by allocating economic and professional resources to expand evidence-based mental health interventions."
Simplifying phrases can improve readability without losing meaning.

Redundancies:
Current text: "This review exposes the limited evidence available to broadly and concretely recommend the use of specific community mhGAP tools."
Suggested revision: "This review highlights the limited evidence supporting the use of specific community mhGAP tools."
Removing redundant adjectives improves conciseness.

Improper Use of Articles:
Current text: "Among the strategies that have been proposed as an essential part of PHC, there are those that allow reducing costs and offering interventions for a greater number of people."
Suggested revision: "Strategies proposed as essential to PHC include those that reduce costs and offer interventions to more people."
Adjustments to article usage (e.g., "the") and phrasing help streamline the sentence.

Q 12 **Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?**

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 **Quality of generalization and summary**

Q 14 **Significance to the field**

Q 15 **Interest to a general audience**

Q 16 **Quality of the writing**

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 **Please take a decision based on your comments:**

Minor revisions.