

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: 35

Title: UNMASKING THE SILENT PANDEMIC: NAVIGATING THE MENTAL HEALTH DYNAMICS AMONG HEALTHCARE WORKERS (HCWS) IN KENYA

Reviewer's Name: Withheld

✓ 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 <i>Exploring mental health stressors among middle level public healthcare managers in Kenya- a qualitative study</i>).		✓			
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	26				

✓ What is your recommendation (*tick appropriately*)?

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

- ✓ 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	

- ✓ 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. Title

- i. The metaphor “Silent Pandemic” is compelling but not scientific in tone; consider balancing creativity with precision.
- ii. Could be more informative by hinting at the study design or main outcome.
- iii. Recommendation: Example: "Mental Health Burden and Resilience Strategies Among Healthcare Workers in Kenya: A Cross-sectional Mixed-Methods Study"

b. Background

- i. Lacks recent broader prevalence data for Kenyan HCWs from literature — current numbers seem to rely on one small CME event.
- ii. Background is narrative-heavy but could benefit from a more systematic review of relevant studies and theories.
- iii. Doesn't explicitly justify the choice of the four counties

c. Methods

- i. Sampling: Justify why Purposive sampling while there are risks selection bias with this type of sampling. Were there inclusion/exclusion criteria.
- ii. Sample size justification: No statistical power calculation provided.
- iii. Qualitative analysis: Labeled as “thematic” but lacks detail on coding process, number of coders, inter-rater reliability, and software used.
- iv. Quantitative analysis: Says “analyzed thematically,” which is unusual for numeric data — statistical tests, measures of central tendency, and inferential analysis are not described.
- v. Time frame: January–May 2024 is clear, but possible seasonal/epidemic events affecting results are not addressed.
- vi. Ethics: provide evidence of ethical approval

d. Results

- i. Lacks measures of precision (confidence intervals) and significance testing — cannot judge reliability of differences.
- ii. Overuse of raw counts without contextualizing in population size or demographics (age, gender, cadre).
- iii. Qualitative findings are summarized but lack illustrative quotes for richness.
- iv. Potential confounding factors (work setting, years of experience) not analyzed.

e. Conclusion

- i. Conclusions are general and policy-oriented but not clearly linked to specific findings in the results section.
- ii. No discussion of study limitations (bias, generalizability, cross-sectional constraints).
- iii. No comparison with existing literature to highlight novelty or alignment.