

Reviewer-2

It would be helpful to see the variety of governmental responses to the pressures placed on law enforcement to respond more effectively to people in mental health crisis.

The authors need to reference more statements in the paper – this is severely lacking.

Specific Comments:

Intro:

1. Given the large discrepancies of police performance around the world, I think you should first situate your literature review in your introduction. I would add more evidence that police response is a big problem.
2. “When police respond to an individual in a mental health crisis, it is more dangerous for the civilian and the officer.” You need a reference here – how do you know? What do you mean by “dangerous” and what country is this data from?
3. You need to explain what “points of intercept models” are.
4. “The hope is that these teams will respond in a safer manner due to their expertise and experience working with mental illness and connect individuals to community-based resources.” Is it the hope or the aim? And this needs a reference.
5. When you say “The number of localities with a crisis response team has grown in recent years; however, many communities still do not have this mechanism in place” you haven’t yet convinced me that a crisis response team is THE solution so it doesn’t necessary follow that localities would have this in place.
6. “State legislation and funding can be a major driver of localities implementing these inter-disciplinary response teams.” Needs a reference.
7. “localities” needs a definition as it is not used everywhere.

Law Enforcement Approaches

8. Your introduction of procedural justice comes out of nowhere.
9. “This is especially the case when their training is inadequate.” Needs a reference.
10. “Internal efforts typically involve improved training on how to better identify and respond to mental health issues.” Needs a reference.
11. You need more references – you are saying things that need to be backed up with evidence.
12. How do you know co-response teams reduce the burden on healthcare?
13. “MCT implementation is less extensive than co-responder teams but provide a clear positive alternative to the status quo.” I’m not convinced this is true with the limited evidence you have cited in this section.

Procedural Justice

14. It seems to me that this section should be moved earlier in your intro
15. “This, along with improved education on mental illness, can improve officer responses to mental illness and build trust.” How do you know?? Needs a reference.
16. You only highlight cooperation in this section – what about ALL the other outcomes/processes that could be improved by using procedural justice to guide the interaction??

Methods

17. This should be its own section.
18. You are missing a lot of information in this section. I would encourage you to consider writing this section out as if someone is going to replicate it. I need to be able to know exactly what and how you did the steps. E.g., where did you find the info? How did you categorize the types of legislation?
19. You did not conduct a “systematic review” in the traditional sense so using this term is confusing.

Results

20. I would have liked to see a state by state breakdown.
21. Your comments on the efforts made by states should be moved to the discussion – they are your interpretations (e.g., pilot programs being more likely to be funded; whether the approach is “aggressive” or not) and not the actual results. OR they could be moved to the methods section where you could provide more information about the categorization of the actions taken.
22. How do you know that permission (level 4) is the first step toward larger scale implementation? Why not pilot projects?
23. How many states had nothing about this legislated?
24. No where in this section do you provide info about analyzing how these programs are aligned with procedural justice??

Discussion

25. When you say it is evident in the first sentence, it is not evident to the reader because you did not say HOW MANY states fell in each of the categories and how many had nothing.
26. The first paragraph is repetitive and can be deleted.
27. Your discussion does not follow your results. How can you say that there is “clear benefit” to the aggressive actions? You don’t present ANY evidence of this in this paper.
28. Again, your emphasis on cooperation is missing a lot of other benefits of procedural justice.
29. And it isn’t clear that procedural justice “clearly aligns” with co-response teams, etc. You have not provided any evidence of this.
30. You need to back up your statements in the discussion. What you are saying doesn’t follow from your results. It is presented more like an opinion paper.

