

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)	Knowledge and attitude of health extension workers towards mental health problems in Jimma zone of Ethiopia. A cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Tesfaye, Yonas; Birhanu, Zewdie; Agenagnew, Liyew; Anand, Susan; Yitbarek, Kiddus; Ahmed, Gutema; Getnet, Masrie; Terefe Tucho, Gudina

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Skundberg-Kletthagen, Hege Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, Department of Health Sciences, Gjøvik
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Mar-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>REVIEWER COMMENTS to Manuscript BMJ open-2020-048381</p> <p>Thanks for the privilege of reviewing this manuscript. This study is essential, with the potential to add important information about the current status of the knowledge and attitudes of HEWs regarding mental health problems.</p> <p>The title is perceived as somewhat unclear. A suggestion is “Health extension workers' perception of mental health problems”</p> <p>In the background, there is a need for more information concerning the HEP and PHC and the content and scope of the teaching on mental health problems in second Generation HEP.</p> <p>What is the curriculum and duration of this education/training program?</p> <p>When the outcome is the HEW's knowledge and attitude towards mental health problems, this should clearly be stated in the aim. Developing research questions might help to focus the aim.</p> <p>Concerning the recruitment/sampling procedure, there is a lack of information about who did the recruitment?</p> <p>The results in table 5 need to be discussed; how to interpret and understand the results? E.g., why is it of interest to compare the income with knowledge and attitude? Is this related to the context of the study?</p> <p>In general, the authors should review the tables concerning content and layout. It should not be repeated in text what is presented in the tables.</p> <p>The authors should address methodological considerations concerning reliability (low Cronbach alpha).</p> <p>Did any of the respondents have any knowledge about mental health when second Generation HEP includes mental health as a component?</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Sai Spoorthy, Mamidipalli Jawaharlal Nehru Medical College
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Mar-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>CONSIDERING THE LIMITED NUMBER OF MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS THROUGH OUT THE WORLD, BETTER KNOWLEDGE OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE WORKERS ABOUT MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IS REQUIRED THE CURRENT STUDY WAS A STEP TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THIS GAP. THE AUTHORS TOOK A GOOD INITIATIVE IN EVALUATING THIS HOWEVER THE MANUSCRIPT NEEDS SOME CORRECTIONS.</p> <p>1. TITLE OF THE STUDY Perception of Health extension workers towards mental health problems, Jimma, Ethiopia BECAUSE THE CURRENT STUDY WAS DONE TO UNDERTAKE KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE EVALUATION OF HEALTH EXTENSION WORKERS, IT'S BETTER TO REFRAME TITLE AS 'KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE OF HEALTH EXTENSION WORKERS TOWARDS MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IN JIMMA ZONE OF ETHIOPIA.'</p> <p>2. ARTICLE SUMMARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many districts were included for generalization to HEWs in comparable rural areas ABOVE STATEMENT TO BE CORRECTED AS ONLY 5 DISTRICTS WERE INCLUDED • The data were initially prepared in English and translated into Afaan Oromo language and back-translated to English to ensure its consistency by blinded language experts. The data were collected through Afaan Oromo and English version of the questionnaire. The translations were face validated by two independent external experts in the field • The data collection tools were not validated in local language THESE TWO STATEMENTS ARE CONTRADICTIONARY IF FACE VALIDATION WAS DONE AFTER TRANSLATION AS MENTIONED IN METHODS THE STATEMENT IN SUMMARY NEEDS TO BE CHANGED <p>3. SAMPLE SAMPLE SIZE CALCULATED WAS 307, OVERALL PARTICIPANTS INCLUDED WERE 259. WHAT WAS THE SAMPLING TECHNIQUE TO INCLUDE HEALTH WORKERS MENTION THE TOTAL NUMBER OF WORKERS IN THE GIVEN STATEMENT, NUMBER APPROACHED All available HEWs working in the selected districts were traced and included in the study</p> <p>4. DISCUSSION THE DISCUSSION IS EXTENSIVE AND INCLUDED ALL THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY. AUTHORS TRY TO CONFINE THE DISCUSSION TO ONLY THE MAIN RESULTS.</p> <p>5. LIMITATIONS THIS HEADING NEEDS TO BE CHANGED COMPLETELY. LIMITATIONS IN THE LITERATURE CANT BE CONSIDERED AS LIMITATIONS IN YOUR STUDY. The major limitation of this study is most of the studies used to compare the findings of this study were from the studies done among the PHC professionals.</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>THIS IS THE NEED FOR THE STUDY AS THE AUTHORS HAVE MENTIONED IN THEIR INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Only a few studies were available on the knowledge and attitude of HEWs regarding mental health problems in the literature.</p> <p>CORRECTION ALREADY MENTIONED IN SUMMARY SECTION</p> <p>Additionally, the data collection tools were not validated in local language</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Thank you all, for your intellectual queries, comments, and suggestions. I have found all critical for the betterment of this manuscript. We have tried to address each of your queries, comments, and suggestions one by one in the main document and the response to the reviewer document. Please let us know if you have any additional comments and suggestions.

Please find attached the revised document and a point by point response to the editor and reviewers' comments

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Skundberg-Kletthagen, Hege Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, Department of Health Sciences, Gjøvik
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Sep-2021
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for this revised version. The authors have revised in line with the feedback. However, I would still recommend considering the layout and size of Tables 3 and 4. You should also do a final check of the language.

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewers' comment

Reviewer 1: Comments to the Author:

Comment 1: Thank you for this revised version. The authors have revised in line with the feedback. However, I would still recommend considering the layout and size of Tables 3 and 4. You should also do a final check of the language.

Response: The layout and size of Tables 3 and 4 were edited as per your comment. Additionally, we have copy-edited the manuscript for the English language.

Thank you