

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Dissemination of evidence by Cochrane Public Health Europe in German-speaking countries: An online stakeholder survey

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Peter Von Philipsborn

Submitted on: 15 Nov 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1605265

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This study reports on an online stakeholder survey examining the reach and the perceived impact of so-called Infomails, i.e. email summaries of Cochrane reviews sent by Cochrane Public Health Europe (CPHE) to selected stakeholders.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The articles strengths include its very important topic (how best to disseminate results of high-quality systematic reviews to evidence users), its robust methodology, and the engaging and easy to follow style in which it is written. Limitations include its limited generalizability (the success of the infomails have depended on the specific expertise and networks of CPHE, and may be difficult to reproduce by others).

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.

This is a well-conducted and well-reported study on an important topic. I have only few minor comments.

Line 34–36: “Barriers to using research evidence in health decision-making include poor access to good-quality, relevant research and lack of timeliness.[6; 7]” While these are certainly important barriers, they are not the only ones that are relevant – presentation of research evidence in formats that are difficult to understand for non-scientists, and limited consideration of the actual evidence needs of practitioners and policy-makers by researchers are other problems that might be worth mentioning.

Line 66–67 (“The Infomail text is prepared according to the Cochrane dissemination checklist.”): Please provide a bit more detail on how, and by whom, the infomails are drafted. (This kind of information is particularly important for people in other organisations that are interested in learning from CPHE with regard to knowledge translation.)

Line 84–85: There are also specific reporting guidelines for survey research – you may want to have a look at these to check if there’s anything else to report about your study that you may have missed (see <https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/good-practice-in-the-conduct-and-reporting-of-survey-research/> and <https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/improving-the-quality-of-web-surveys-the-checklist-for-reporting-results-of-internet-e-surveys-cherries/>).

Line 95–96: It may be interesting to readers to learn how the open rate is determined in Mailchimp (i.e. how it is determined if an email was opened or not – as far as I know, this works with embedded links).

Line 136–138: “Furthermore, one researcher categorised all qualitative answers to the open-ended questions, and a second researcher checked these new categories.” What is meant with “categorised”? Were the qualitative answered coded deductively (i.e. with pre-defined codes), or inductively (i.e. with codes developed based on the data, i.e. the answers), or does this mean something else? A slightly more detailed elaboration on this would be helpful.

Line 149–152: It seems that more than half of all reviews (8 out of 15) were on nutrition. This may have influenced the results, and may be worth mentioning also somewhat more prominently, e.g. in the abstract or the introduction (i.e. not only under results).

Line 191: What is meant with “administrative organisations”? It might be helpful to provide an example of such an organisation.

Line 215–216: Please report here (or somewhere else) the average length and word count of the infomails in general, and of the example info mail included in your survey.

Line 247–254: You may want to consider presenting this information (on the most commonly types of information) as a graph – this could make it easier to get a quick, intuitive grasp of the data.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

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

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.