

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Measurement properties of the Mental Health Literacy Scale (MHLS) validation studies: a systematic review protocol
AUTHORS	EIKhalil, Rouwida; AlMekawi, Mohamad; O'Connor, Matt; Sherif, Moustafa; Masuadi, Emad; Ahmed, Luai; Al-Rifai, Rami H.; Belfakir, Messaouda; Bayoumi, Rasha; Elbarazi, Iffat

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Chen, Haoyang Shanghai Childrens Medical Center Affiliated to Shanghai Jiaotong University School of Medicine, Nursing
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Nov-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an article of significant value. However, there are some aspects that require further improvement. Firstly, the language and writing style need to be strengthened.</p> <p>Additionally, the reference list needs to be updated and the overall formatting of the paper should be refined to better align with the requirements of the journal.</p> <p>In terms of the introduction, it is recommended to present the content in a hierarchical and layered manner. Furthermore, the discussion section lacks a thorough explanation of the significance of this article, which needs to be addressed and revised.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Macleod, Emily Australian National University, Centre for Mental Health Research
REVIEW RETURNED	08-Jan-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This proposed review has the potential to provide a valuable resource for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the MHLS for cross-cultural use as a measurement tool to identify MH literacy levels.</p> <p>Limitations: If a key goal is to compare the properties of different language versions of the MHLS, it seems a major limitation to exclude non-English papers.</p> <p>Introduction: In the background, it would be useful to provide an overview indicating that the MHLS scale has been validated and has promising psychometric properties.</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Search strategy: Can the authors provide more detail regarding the anticipated review team (how many people, their expected expertise and qualifications)?</p> <p>Data charting: More clarification is needed to explain "results (rating)." E.g., rating of what? Examples would be helpful.</p> <p>Quantitatively pooling the results: The authors state "To conduct meta-analyses, we will be consulting a statistician." It would be useful to provide an a priori indication of factors that will be considered regarding conducting a meta-analysis, and analysis approaches planned. For example, how will the heterogeneity of studies be addressed? How will demographic characteristics such as age, gender, and SES be considered as influences in analyses?</p> <p>General: The document should be edited for grammar and typos (e.g., Abstract: some brackets missing from the abbreviations in the abstracts (MHL, MHLS). Aims: p5, line 6, the first word of the sentence needs a capital). P8 line 31, missing space after "reviewers.".</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 Comments	Authors' Actions And Comments
1. The language and writing style needs to be strengthened.	Extensive English language was conducted as recommended to enhance the article's presentation and comprehension.
2. The reference list needs to be updated, and the overall formatting of the paper should be refined to better align with the journal's requirements.	The references were examined to retain essential articles needed to accomplish the objective and support the arguments. They were also reviewed to align with the journal requirement.
3. Regarding the introduction, it is recommended to present the content in a hierarchical and layered manner.	We thank the reviewer for this comment, which helped us enhance the introduction. The introduction was revised and adjusted to enhance its coherence and lucidity.
4. The discussion section lacks a thorough explanation of the significance of this article, which needs to be addressed and revised.	We thank the reviewer for this particular comment, which helped us enhance the discussion. The comment was attended to, and the discussion section was amended. We have included a comprehensive elucidation of the importance of this article.
Reviewer 1 Comments	Authors' Actions And Comments
1. Limitations: If a key goal is to compare the properties of different language versions of the MHLS, it seems a major limitation to exclude non-English papers.	Including only English papers was identified as a significant limitation and added to the list of limitations (line 30, page 1, and line 342, page 11).
2. Introduction: In the background, it would be useful to provide an overview indicating that the MHLS scale has been validated and has promising psychometric properties.	We thank the reviewer for this comment, which helped us enhance the background. A summary highlighting the validation and promising

	psychometric properties of the MHLS scale has been included in the introduction section (line 111, page 3).
3. Search strategy: Can the authors provide more detail regarding the anticipated review team (how many people, their expected expertise, and qualifications)?	The information is detailed in a paragraph labeled "Contributions" after the protocol (line 347, page 12). Additional information was also provided under the heading of the search strategy (lines 211 and 216, page 6).
4. Data charting: More clarification is needed to explain "results (rating)." E.g., rating of what? Examples would be helpful.	We thank the reviewer for this comment. The rating of the measurement properties results is elaborated in the concluding sentences of the data charting section (line 263, page 8). Table 4 presents comprehensive illustrations of each measurement property and the corresponding rating (line 276, page 8). Revisions and headings were added to clarify the evaluated concepts (lines 247 and 261, page 8).
5. Quantitatively pooling the results: The authors state "To conduct meta-analyses, we will be consulting a statistician." It would be useful to provide an a priori indication of factors that will be considered regarding conducting a meta-analysis and analysis approaches planned. For example, how will the heterogeneity of studies be addressed?	To address the heterogeneity of studies, it was necessary to pool results only when there are more than two investigations per measurement property and language version. We reviewed this section and presented a preliminary indication of the factors to consider when performing pooling and the planned approaches for analysis (line 287, page 10).
6. How will demographic characteristics such as age, gender, and SES be considered as influences in analyses?	We intend to present a concise overview of the stated demographic characteristics. Since individual studies have already examined demographic factors that influence mental health literacy (MHL), our systematic review will specifically identify and analyze these factors. Specific hypotheses for 'Hypothesis Testing for Construct Validity' were formulated under "Evaluation of measurement properties" in the MHLS (line 267, page 8). The analysis, titled "Comparison between subgroups (Divergent validity)," aims to assess if there are statistically significant variations in MHLS scores among specific demographic groups (refer to supplementary 4).
7. General: The document should be edited for grammar and typos (e.g., Abstract: some brackets missing from the abbreviations in the abstracts (MHL, MHLS). Aims: p5, line 6, the first word of the sentence needs a capital). P8 line 31, missing space after "reviewers.".	The article's English language was reviewed and edited to enhance its presentation and comprehension.