Peer Review Report

Review Report on Mobile-based application interventions to enhance cancer control and care in low-and middle-income countries: a systematic review

---

EVALUATION

Q 1 ▸ Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The aim of this paper is to systematically review to enhance cancer control and care in low-and middle-income countries

---

Q 2 ▸ Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The review was well peer-reviewing conducted, however I found two main limitations:
1. The protocol was not registered (which is a recommendation of Prisma Statement)
2. This included different study designs, which makes me feel that it is a scoping review instead of a systematic review

According the authors, another strength is that it is the first systematic review about interventions implemented to help control and manage cancer in LMICs.
The limitations are that are that the
review did not search app stores, so useful cancer control and care mAPP interventions not published in peer-review journals may have been overlooked. At the same time, however, other reviews have found that mAPP interventions that have not been published are unlikely to have been extensively user-tested and often have limited usability (Bhattarai et al. 2018). Perhaps most importantly, while several of the mAPP interventions we identified had satisfactory usability, our review could not identify robust evidence for the effectiveness of mAPP interventions in achieving positive cancer control and care outcomes in LMICs. Poor access to mobile technology, low digital skills and low health and written literacy levels were missing from the MIND framework. Finally, the available literature does not provide detailed information on data manage of cancer control and care mAPPs such as the costs and number of downloads, making it difficult to ascertain how widely used the intervention are.

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

Dear authors, thank you for giving me the opportunity of reviewing this interesting manuscript. Bellow, I give some comments that can help to improve it:
Major comments:
1. An important concern is that the protocol of the review was not registered. What is the reason for this?
2. Other concern is that I feel that given the different kind of studies that your included, I seems to be a scoping review instead of a systematic review (that should aimed to compare the effectiveness of different interventions or to compare risk factors).

Minor comments:
1. Introduction: I recommend read and city the WHO Guidelines "Recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening", especially the following ones: WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Research considerations. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019. (WHO/RHR/19.9) Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

2. Methods:

Regarding keywords, who did you reach the appropriate keywords from free language (clarify in the text)? I see that in the search 5, you did not include the search in keyword filed, why did you not?

Regarding dates, considering the registers included in the different databases (each of one started to include registered from a specific date), from what dated did you started to look for the studies? Did you did forward searches?

I do not understand the following exclusion criterium: " studies reported without full text (only abstract). Could you explain this?

3. Results:

In table 1, regarding experimental studies, you should include the following information: follow-ups, attrition rate, effect size on outcomes variables.

In the same table, in general, the characteristic of the sample is poorly described, I think that it is important to know the social status, the religion, among other socio-demographic traits.

In table 2, the mAPPs should be systematically described, I recommend to include information about theoretical background, objective, contents, number of sessions and duration of them, if there were implementers. I think that is also important highlight how was designed the intervention.

4. Discussion:

The effectiveness of interventions included must be deeply reflected. One of the gaps in digital health research is the lack of studies on effectiveness of interventions. This is an important issue to be addressed.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

They should consider the WHO Guidelines "Recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening", especially the following ones: WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Research considerations. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019. (WHO/RHR/19.9) Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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, it has.

Q 9   **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

One of my main concern it is about the study design, I think that it is a scoping review instead of a systematic review

| Q 10 | **Are the keywords appropriate?** |

Yes, they are.

| Q 11 | **Is the English language of sufficient quality?** |

I am not a native English, but it seems ok

| 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.