

Journal title: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 83941

Title: Exploratory Systematic Review and Meta-analysis on Period Poverty

Reviewer #1 - ACCEPTED

Reviewer #2

Reviewer Comment	Author Response	Page
1. Specify what makes this article different from the rest of studies that are available in the literature.	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>This study provides a comprehensive review of all evidence and literature on period poverty across low- and middle-income countries, something which has not been done to this scale before. It highlights the lack of data available in this field, hence the inability to carry out a meta-analysis on the findings. Whilst we acknowledge the limitations of our own data set (i.e., small samples sizes and specific geographical locations), this systematic review uncovers important findings and highlights gaps in current knowledge. This can be used to inform areas of future research, where better understandings of this</p>	n/a

	<p>problem will inform new policies, and practices.</p> <p>WJOP does not have a section on: what did others do and how different is ours as such the format of the paper is aligned to the journal guidelines. Also this is an evidence synthesis and therefore the goal is to synthesise the existing evidence to demonstrate the current research and practice gaps so that these can be addressed with comprehensive research studies. We have stipulated that our article is the first to have comprehensively synthesised key healthcare and clinical outcomes that is linked to period poverty.</p>	
<p>2. The conclusion section needs to list the conclusions of this study and not write irrelevant content.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>We believe the statements raised in the conclusion have direct relevance to what was explored in the manuscript, highlight future clinical applications of this research. Amendments have been made. We have concluded the study along with recommendations based on</p>	<p>Page 18</p>

	<p>the findings as this is more appropriate for future researchers, clinicians and policy makers to consider. The impact of period poverty needs to be addressed by multiple key stakeholders, as stipulated so in our conclusion</p>	
<p>3. It should contain the limitations of the study and clearly list the shortcomings of the study.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>Limitations have been explored within the discussion section across Pages 17 and 18. The points raised included lack of evidence of period poverty and the mental health implications in LMICs. There were limited sample sizes and/or geographical locations limiting the generalisability of findings. The limitations section included details of the notions of the data along with the discussion. Statistical limitations have been demonstrated within the publication bias portion.</p>	<p>Page 17 -18</p>