

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Original article: Alcohol Screening and Brief Intervention in Primary Health Care in Kazakhstan –Results of a Cluster randomised Pilot Study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Laura Acosta

Submitted on: 17 Mar 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604803

### EVALUATION

#### Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study outcomes indicate that screening for alcohol followed by a standardised brief intervention is feasible and can be implemented in PHC settings in Kazakhstan.

#### Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The contribution of this study is very important for the public health. I think it is very well writing, the bibliography used is complete and updated. I simply consider that there is a mistake in the objective and assessment of the effectiveness of a pilot study.

#### Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The contribution of this study is very important for the public health. I think it is very well writing, the bibliography used is complete and updated. However, I think there are a problem with the objective, because in the abstract the objective says: "The aim of this pilot trial was to assess the feasibility of ASBI in primary health care units (PHCU) in Kazakhstan" and in the introduction is: "The primary aim of this pilot cluster-randomised trial was to assess the feasibility of ASBI implementation in primary health care units (PHCU) in Kazakhstan and to compare its efficacy against simple feedback as a control intervention". I don't agree with evaluate "efficacy" in a pilot study, and the primary objective must be asses the "feasibility", indeed, I consider that efficacy is not appropriate to be evaluated in a pilot study, even as a secondary objective.

### PLEASE COMMENT

#### Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

#### Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

No. the authors must review MESH terms.

#### Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes


#### Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?


Yes.


**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)


Yes, the bibliography is relevant and update.


**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**


**Q 9** Originality 

**Q 10** Rigor 

**Q 11** Significance to the field 

**Q 12** Interest to a general audience 

**Q 13** Quality of the writing 

**Q 14** Overall scientific quality of the study 

**REVISION LEVEL**

**Q 15** Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.