

Review of: "Perceptions and Experiences of Human Right Violations of People Living with Mental Illness: A multi-centre descriptive cross-sectional study in Nigeria"

Andel V. Nicasio¹

¹ Carlos Albizu University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thanks for the opportunity to review this paper. The primary focus on the perceptions and experiences of individuals with mental illnesses on human rights violations is an important and pertinent topic. One of this paper's strengths is the strategy of using a large sample size and multiple sites. In order to address human rights violations, the paper discusses potential solutions to the issue and emphasizes the necessity of functional legislation as well as the involvement of service check systems in health facilities. However, taking into account the following recommendations can greatly enhance the paper.

Minor points:

1. "PLWMI" should be clearly understood as the initials of People Living with Mental Illness.
2. While presenting the death rate of PLWMI due to avoidable physical illnesses, examples of those recurrent illnesses should be added to enhance readers' understanding of the importance of this issue.
3. "Mental health providers" should be used instead of "mental health experts" in the Introduction section when discussing how PLWMI are disregarded by peers. Mental health providers encompass a broader and larger group, which helps to emphasize this critical challenge in our field.
4. The second citation in the article comes from the United Nations, which is a suitable and convenient moment to list this organization as an in-text citation. This will clarify the information and relevance to the readers.
5. There is a typo on Table 4 where "SA" = strongly agree, is identified as "A"). The document's overall grammar should be revised.

Moderate points

1. In the Data Analysis section, the questionnaire used to collect the data should include more information regarding the qualitative limits of the categorizations of perception of human rights: "poor or negative perception," "good," and "very good."
2. Please provide results from between-groups differences. Given that this is a clever approach of this article, it is pertinent to inform whether there are differences between sites based on demographic characteristics and the main variables.
3. In the section on "Study Population," patients were described as "relatively sound of mind," which could be perceived

as disrespectful to some readers. Please double-check the journal's requirements for describing vulnerable populations. Additionally, no measure was used to actually determine the current state of mind, such as the mental health status. As such, this should be added as a recommendation for future research and also as one of the limitations of the study, given the variability of mental health diagnoses and treatment.

4. When describing the instruments or the procedures, it is relevant to include how long it took to complete each of the questionnaires or, at the very least, how long it took to administer the entire protocol on average.
5. Although I appreciate listing the hypotheses followed by the results section for each one, the introduction or justification section does not discuss the rationale for the specific hypotheses. Thus, they seemed to be presented without sufficient theoretical basis to support the direction of each hypothesis. Please either add more information to support the direction of each hypothesis in the introduction/justification section or before/after each of the hypotheses. Also, please review the journal guide and other papers in this journal to verify the format or organization of the paper.
6. PLWMI are described as "very insightful" regarding their human rights during the "Discussion." Perhaps a more appropriate term could be "understanding" or "knowledgeable." The entire sentence seems to deviate from the objective measures included in this study. Please be conservative when reporting extrapolations from the data.
7. Lastly, the study's use of a multiple-site approach is well presented. However, in the same way, limitations should also be described, as well as recommendations for future research and potential clinical, legal, and policy recommendations. Please add separate sections/paragraphs for limitations, future research recommendations, and clinical implications.