# Review of: "Inclusive Academic Advising for students with mental health issues. The views and experiences of Academic Advisors"

David Watson[1]

1 University of East Anglia

The research addresses an important and emerging area of a university's role in supporting student mental health. Whilst the the summary of literature and the discourse on student mental health is useful it is a bit overlong and repetitive. I missed a bit the relevance of wider trends in the UK that mental health issues on rising significantly in the general population and particularly young people so what universities are experiencing in shifts in demand is not only an outcome of widening participation and a more diverse student cohort. The authors are though right to raise these as relevant points that are driving demand experienced by academic advisors and universities more generally.

I was a bit confused by the presence of both a conceptual and theoretical framework in a paper of this sort and I am not sure how it related to either the collection or analysis of data. It seems to me that you have a very exploratory study of the challenges from the perspectives of academic advisors, which is fine but is necessarily limited. So the main point for me is that universities have not really grappled with how best to support the academic and the student and this is really reflected in your data. This shows a huge lack of clarity of roles, boundaries and consequently knowledge and access to support and training. It would be helpful here for the authors to be more directive in arguing for shifts in research and practice that can be helpfully evaluated to better understand the issue/s and how to address them. Would more in depth qualitative work, perhaps incorporating students' voices be useful, or larger scale more rigorous quantitative studies - perhaps in tandem, or even more action/participatory research?

One more minor point, you have given the university a pseudonym but SU is a bit confusing as it could be easily mixed up with SU as in students union. More seriously though this is for anonymity purposes but you have a quote that fairly clearly identifies the first author's institution as the research setting.

Last point, there is an awful lot of self-referencing in this piece, while I'm not saying it isn't important to draw connections to your previous work and it is no doubt relevant, I do think you needn't always refer back to your own work to support points. The danger is there is a circularity to this and it undermines rigor. I hope the authors pursue further research in this area, which is an important practical challenge for the sector.