

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Care cascades for hypertension in low-income settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Biju Soman

Submitted on: 02 Sep 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606428

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

It is a well-conceived and well-conducted systematic review of hypertension and its management in low-income settings. The authors have meticulously followed all the requirements of the conduct of systematic reviews and searched four established databases for the same.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This brings in quality evidence on the rate and control of hypertension in low-income settings.

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

The article deserves much appreciation for adhering to all the requirements of conducting systematic reviews. There are only a few typographical mistakes(a few listed below), that need correction. Also, I suggest that the supplementary materials should be named properly, not as tables 1-4, as they are not tables per se. "Data about risk factors (e.g., smoking), BMI, diabetes, sex, age mean, or median were also retrieved when present." (page six, line 62)

"We considered four stages of the hypertension continuum of care which correspond to prevalence, awareness, treatment, and control." (page 6, line 86)

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Quite relevant for a systematic review

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 (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)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?

Sure, hypertension being a leading risk factor for cardiovascular morbidity and mortality, this review would be a valuable asset to medical science.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

yes, care cascade is the only non-standard phrase, but the authors have sufficiently explained it in the article.

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, minor typological error, as mentioned in the reply to the authors, need correction.

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:

Minor revisions.