

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Skill-mix, health promotion, prevention, advanced practice, task-shifting, ambulatory care, innovation

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Bosiljka Djikanovic

Submitted on: 22 Dec 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605448

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

Thank you for an opportunity to review this manuscript that overviews the reviews of two important aspects: the impact (or effectiveness) of skill-mix changes on the health promotion and prevention activities. After reviewing the manuscript, at the very beginning of my comments, I suggest authors to consider sharpening the focus of the paper, starting from the title. At the moment, the reader might be unsure about the purpose of conducting this study. Is it the adequacy of skill mix changes in health promotion? How about starting with the "The impact of (skill-mix changes ...)" or "The effectiveness of (skill-mix changes)", and then omitting the part "(...) and evidence on outcomes". This is just suggestion.

In Introduction, I miss to read more on the rationale for conducting this study, and answers on the questions such as Why skill-mix changes (perhaps to be accommodated somewhere around line 36–38) , and What are the impacts of skill-mix changes (that would justify conducting this review). I also miss to read a kind of hypothesis prior to method.

In the Method, under the Types of studies, I miss to read the key word "trial", as I expect that "narrative analysis or meta-analysis" are made up of trials, where we have two interventions compared. Also, throughout the Results, it would be good to consistently reflect on the comparison groups. If they are missing (such as in the line 251–252, or 284–286 part related to physical activity, for example).

I would also like to emphasize that it was corectly stated in the line 271 "(...) yet it was not specified what the comparison group entailed".

In a Discussion, and throughout the manuscript, I suggest to keep focus on the "skill-mix changes" for the sake of "health promotion and prevention", and do not be afraid of the repetition of the term. For example, the first sentence in a Discussion should be really expanded, to remind reader what is the purpose of the study. In line 413–414 it is unclear whether that statement related to cost-effectiveness is your own result or comes from the cited literature, so please correct accordingly. Especially since I have not read about it in the results, and it should be consistent throughout the text.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

No answer given.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

No answer given.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

No answer given.

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

yes

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

it should be improved

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

the key word "change" is missing

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Quality of generalization and summary



Q 14 Significance to the field



Q 15 Interest to a general audience



Q 16 Quality of the writing



REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.