2nd National Mental Health Conference

Abstracts Review Guide

THEME: Holistic Approach to Mental Health for Generations

SUB-THEMES

1. Foundations of mental health: A focus on the family, children, and youth mental health
2. Promoting Workplace Mental Well-being: Creating Supportive Environments Across All Sectors
3. From Awareness to Action: Suicide Prevention Across the Lifespan
4. Advancing Mental Health through Research, Innovation and Technology
5. Strengthening Mental Health Systems through Capacity Building for mental Healthcare workforce
6. Community Approaches: Advocacy, Education and Addressing Cultural issues

Review guidelines

Manuscript No: 14

Title: An Assessment of Training Gaps, Barriers, and Facilitators in Managing Postpartum Depression Among Healthcare Workers and Policymakers in Nairobi, Kenya, and Zomba, Malawi

Reviewer's Name: Withheld

1. Rate the abstract as per the scale below

5 = Excellent
1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5
Does the abstract title align with the conference themes? (Title should be clear what is investigated, who is involved, where, and method e,g *Exploring mental health stressors among middle level public healthcare managers in Kenya- a qualitative study*).				✔	
Is the main question/Aim/Objective addressed by the research clear, interesting, relevant, and original and aligns to the topic and theme?			✔		
Is the rationale for the article well grounded (Is it Based on a known theory or intended to fill a well-articulated gap?		✔			
Is the methodology appropriate and applied properly? ● Is it appropriate based on the objectives/aim/questions of the study?			✔		

• Does methodology align with best practices for replicability and robustness? • Is there description of study population, area, data collection approach, time (year) • Where relevant, does the study indicate clear statistical measures and qualitative analyses that informs study • Is the data analysis appropriate, accurate and rigorous					
Did author adhere to ethical research standards? (If ethical approval is not evident but required, kindly highlight this in the comments section and request the same from the author) • Given the increased vulnerability associated with mental health research, assess whether the manuscript mentions specific measures taken to protect participants from potential harm. • If the study was conducted within an institution, confirm whether appropriate institutional permissions were obtained. • Is there clear evidence that the researcher sought and received relevant ethical approval from an accredited body? • Are ethical procedures and safeguards clearly outlined in the methodology? • For studies involving participants with lived experience of mental illness, check whether the abstract specifies any reasonable accommodations provided. • For desk reviews, systematic reviews, or studies using only secondary data with no direct interaction with human subjects, indicate N/A.		✔			
Are the results and conclusions based on data analyzed? (results aren't overstated or overgeneralized, or irrelevant; Are policy implications clearly articulated?)			✔		
Is the abstract based on rigorous research? (follow academic standards)		✔			
Does the abstract clearly illustrate the problem, the gap, how the study intends to address it			✔		
Does the abstract convey the main ideas in a clear and understandable manner (is it Well organized, clearly written)				✔	
Does the article offer a substantial contribution science? For instance, is it highly significant, contextually novel within the Kenyan setting, groundbreaking in its findings, or does it lay a strong foundation for future research? Additionally, how does the abstract advance the field compared to existing literature?				✔	

Is the Abstract clearly written, and is the argument easy to follow?			✔		
TOTAL	**33**				

2. What is your recommendation (***tick appropriately***)?

Accept, as is	
Accept with minor revisions	
Accept with major revisions	✔
Clear reject	

3. If you Recommended the article to be accepted (Accept, as is: Accept with minor revisions: Accept with major revisions) which **subtheme** below does the abstract fall into to? (***tick appropriately***)?

Foundations of mental health: A focus on the family, children, and youth mental health	
Promoting Workplace Mental Well-being: Creating Supportive Environments Across All Sectors	
From Awareness to Action: Suicide Prevention Across the Lifespan	
Advancing Mental Health through Research, Innovation and Technology	
Strengthening Mental Health Systems through Capacity Building for mental Healthcare workforce	✔
Community Approaches: Advocacy, Education and Addressing Cultural issues	

4. If you Recommended the article to be accepted (Accept, as is: Accept with minor revisions: Accept with major revisions) what comments do you have for the author to help them improve on their abstract? (***the comments here will be shared with the author***)

A. **Methods Transparency:** Describe sampling, instrument validation, data analysis methods, and ethical approvals **(provide evidence of ethical approval).** The study setting description is minimal — "two facilities in Nairobi" and "two in Zomba" without details of facility type, catchment population, or selection criteria limits replicability. The sampling method is not specified — were respondents randomly selected, purposively sampled, or convenience sampled?
    a. **Provide evidence ethical approval**
B. **Quantitative Analysis:** Quantitative data (percentages) are presented without statistical analysis — no p-values, confidence intervals, or tests for significance.

C. **Qualitative Rigor:** Explain coding method, provide more representative quotes, and ensure themes are systematically derived. Unclear how FGDs and interviews were analyzed (thematic analysis? grounded theory? software used? coding process? inter-rater reliability?)
D. **Alignment**: Ensure conclusions strictly reflect findings, without introducing untested interventions.
E. **Discussion:** No acknowledgment of limitations (sampling bias, small sample size, self-reported data, potential social desirability bias). No exploration of why confidence in care provision (62.1%) is high despite low formal training — could be overestimation or cultural perception differences. In addition, the Sample size (58) is small and may not be representative; this limitation should be explicitly stated.
F. **Results:** Provide findings on Facilitators in Managing Postpartum Depression Among Healthcare Workers. No subgroup analysis (e.g., differences between Kenya and Malawi respondents, or between specialists and non-specialists).
G. **Conclusion:** The conclusion is more advocacy-oriented than strictly evidence-based in parts (e.g., recommending “low-cost therapies” without evaluating their effectiveness in the study)