

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Measures to contain the transmission of Hepatitis C in a chronic kidney care hospital unit in the Triângulo Mineiro in Brazil: a case study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Simone Schenkman

Submitted on: 09 Apr 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605914

### EVALUATION

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

The study demonstrates good practice and organizational strategies for the microelimination of the C virus in a public hospital hemodialysis unit, contributing to future research that expands methodologies for service evaluation regarding the implementation of critical event management strategies.

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

Strengths: The effective local results in preventing HCV infection and the step-by-step model presented may be a useful resource for professional training and organization of services, by detailing the measures to contain the transmission of Hepatitis C in a public hospital hemodialysis unit. Especially for similar settings, that is, low and middle income countries, with HIV treatment and injecting drug usage as concurrent factors. Limitations: the case studies are not subject to a generalization other than their analytical understanding of theories and scenarios. The case study design has its generalization limitations, but it was the proper method to be applied.

#### **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.

Major:

Introduction (line 15/16, you should be careful with nomenclature of universal health coverage that supports the SUS; you should rather use universal health system, which is appropriate to the SUS system, much broader than universal health coverage building blocks.

You should further discuss the role of the interdisciplinary team and the nursing supervision: explore its importance, difficulties and means of implementation you have experienced and how to overcome them.

Table 2 would be more interesting if you exhibited the differences between the Hepatitis cases and the rest of the hemodialysis patients, concerning the clinical and epidemiological variables

Minor:

You should describe the HCV prevalence in the general population, as you compare the HDU patients' prevalence to that of the general population in the third and fourth paragraphs of the Introduction section.

Is there any implication for the HCV genotype 1a detected? You could discuss it, for example is that the genotype expected locally? Does it have a higher resilience for some antiviral options for treatment?

Revise the text thoroughly, because sometimes a verb or complement is missing. although it is well written and we may understand most of it, it is important to improve it for the final version

### PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes. Maybe it should change from – Measures to contain the transmission of Hepatitis C in a hospital unit for chronic kidney care: a case study to –Measures to contain the transmission of Hepatitis C in a public hospital hemodialysis unit: a case study – to be more specific.

**Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

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

Yes, it needs a minor overall revision, as some sentences need a verb or complement.

Example: int he abstract (material and methods): The intentional and purposeful collection of information for understanding the event and implementing interventions.

**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**

<b>Q 9</b> Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 10</b> Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 11</b> Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 12</b> Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 13</b> Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 14</b> Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**REVISION LEVEL**

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

Minor revisions.