

Review of: "Internal migration and mental disorders among the adult population: a community-based cross-sectional study in Nepal"

Nancy Crowell¹

¹ Georgetown University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I wonder about the definition of a migrant – it seems to me that the time since internal migration would matter as much or more than just having migrated at some point. Other reviewers have noted the issues with the definition of mental disorder.

Considering the sampling strategy, why didn't you weight the analyses based on sampling probability? Also, Chart 1, which was to show the sampling strategy, was not in the article.

Table 3 and Table 4– the p-value never equals 0.00 – if it is less than .001, you need to report it as "< .001"; otherwise, report the actual value to three decimal places if $p < .01$.

Discussion: "The present study showed that migrants were less likely (aOR=0.98, 0.78-1.22, $p=0.86$) to have a mental disorder than the original participants, which is similar to the results of a study conducted in China [5]; however, the present study's results were not found to be statistically significant." You cannot say that migrants were less likely to have a mental disorder based on an OR of .98 and a p-value of .86. Based on these results, you should say that there was NO DIFFERENCE in mental disorders by migration status. As noted above, I suspect that defining migration status with no regard to the time of migration status dilutes the potential effect of migration. I believe you should raise this in the discussion.