

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_117295
Title of the Manuscript:	MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES IN NIGERIA: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW.
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is highly relevant to the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of mental health services in Nigeria, a country with significant mental health challenges and limited resources. The systematic review provides valuable insights into the barriers to accessing mental health services, the attitudes of health workers, and policy recommendations, which can inform future research, policy-making, and interventions in similar low and middle-income countries. The title is generally suitable, but for better clarity and impact, consider: "Barriers and Attitudes Towards Mental Health Services in Nigeria: A Systematic Review". The abstract is informative but needs better organization and clarity. It should succinctly present the background, methods, key findings, and implications. For instance, clearly separate the background information from the methods, results, and conclusions. The manuscript's structure is mostly appropriate, but some sections could benefit from clearer headings and subheadings. Ensure consistent formatting and logical flow from the introduction to the conclusions. The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, but more detailed descriptions of the methods used in the included studies would enhance transparency and replicability. Also, a more thorough discussion on the implications of the findings and limitations of the review should be included. The references are mostly sufficient and relevant. However, ensure that all cited studies are the most recent and relevant. You may want to include recent studies or reviews from other low and middle-income countries for a comparative perspective. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The language is generally suitable but requires some minor edits for grammar, punctuation, and clarity. For example, ensure all sentences are complete and avoid run-on sentences. Improve readability by breaking long paragraphs into shorter ones. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider including a flowchart in the methods section to visually represent the study selection process, which would enhance the clarity and transparency of the review methodology. The inclusion of tables summarizing key findings from the reviewed studies is excellent. Ensure all tables are clearly labeled and referenced in the text. Expand the discussion section to include more on the policy implications of your findings and potential strategies to address identified barriers. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rohini Kancharapu
Department, University & Country	Gayatri Vidya Parishad College of Engineering for Women, Andhra University, India