

Review Comments-1:

Yes. The increasing number of mental illness is called attention and the scholarship of

Overall, the paper has presented a detailed review study on PM+, but what is PM + and how it was conducted it is not clearly presented. Furthermore, I have some comments on Results and Discussion part:

1. Results Section

Comment: The results section is critical in a scoping review, as it presents the mapped evidence. If the findings are not clearly organized or visualized, readers may struggle to grasp the key insights.

So, I would suggest a table or figure to visualize your findings, particularly findings about the barriers at different levels you mention."

2. Discussion Section

interventions should be addressed to lay the foundation for future studies. PM + is a new thing and deserve attention in mental health study.

The title is too long.

Proposed one: **A Scoping Review of Barriers and Lessons Learned from Implementing the Who-Designed Problem Management Plus Globally**

Comment: The discussion section should interpret the findings in the context of the research question, highlight gaps in the literature, and propose implications for research, policy, or practice. But here, the gaps you find are not explicitly stated and the implications for future research, policy or practice is missing. For example, as you have identify the challenges facing by lay volunteers, what kind of support your could suggest to sustain them in future practice, etc?