

Review of: "The Effect of Group-Based Family Orientation to Community Mental Health Services"

Philip Tyson¹

¹ University of South Wales

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract:

Why is the abbreviation for family orientation session 'IGS', instead of FOS?

Methods should be in the past tense

Main article

Introduction – Recovery-Focused Treatment section

In the paragraph beginning -*Recovery-oriented mental health*, some of the full stops are in the incorrect places.

This introduction needs to give some detail as to which client groups benefit from this approach and which don't. Which client groups have been included in previous studies, e.g., those with schizophrenia, eating disorder, major depression ect. Essentially the reader needs to know if this methods suits specific groups, or whether it has been found to be beneficial for all.

A table / chart describing the focus of each weekly IGS is needed, e.g., what happens in week 1, week 2 ect. This will aid the implementation of similar initiatives and help the authors identify the most and least useful components in future research.

In the Data section, there needs to be greater clarity about the measures used and some information about their content and psychometric properties (reliability, validity). It is unclear what the '*Western Canada Waitlist Children's Mental Health Priority Criteria Score Survey*' is, and whether it has sound psychometric properties. This is also an issue with the '*Adverse Childhood Experience Survey*' and the '*Measurable Treatment Plan (MTP)*'. For an international audience, all of these measurement tools need much more explanation.

In the Analysis section it is unclear why no statistical tests were used to analyse the data. This should be explained. Indeed, under table 3 there is a reference to a p-value, so some statistical tests must have been conducted. A Chi square might be appropriate to see if there was a statistically significant in admissions between the exposed and unexposed groups.

Sample description – should this say ‘self-defined gender’ rather than ‘self-defined sex’?

Table 4 in the results section is very unclear. Its key message is difficult to discern. Perhaps some detailed text should be presented with it to guide the reader.

Another suggestion for future research is to survey the participants in the family orientation sessions to get a personal perspective on their value.