

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

Hiro Nakao

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First of all, I would like to express respect for the important practical efforts made by the authors. It is therefore regrettable that some structural and methodological flaws make the manuscript unreadable. There are too many general explanations and too few explanations of this study. The manuscript does not seem to go beyond the activity report for those already with some knowledge of recovery-oriented services.

Abstract section does not include the information of study participants, that is, for whom IGS is aimed at.

Introduction section suddenly talks about the research objectives. As written in the reporting guidelines, it usually describes the background and context of the study, i.e., the unknown problems in the field, following the objectives. Again, there is no description of the study targets.

The next two sections are too lengthy. It would be better to summarize only those topics relevant to the current study. If necessary, other topics could be moved to Discussion section. Especially, Local Context section is difficult to understand what is being explained.

Methods section lacks the details of IGS. Most readers may not be able to follow what intervention was carried out. Also, the participants' selection method is missing.

Study Design section is hard to understand. The grouping explanation is too complicated. If IGS has been offered since November 2016 as described in the previous section, only a historical cohort design may be possible.

Analysis section is too short and lacks statistical methods. No mention of LOS, which is analyzed later.

Sample description section mentions 1352 and 1368 individuals, but these numbers do not appear in any table.

Table 1 has no explanation. There is no definition of group 0-3.

Table 3 mentions a p-value, but the statistical method generating the value is unexplained.

Clinical Profile of Groups section should be placed further forward.

The conclusion seems overstated. The concurrent study design can't detect any direct effects.

Discussion section also goes over the current study. What the current finding adds is difficult to get.