Peer Review Report

Review Report on The Transformative Impact of Community-Led Monitoring in the South African Health System: A Comprehensive Analysis

Original Article, Int J Public Health

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study showed that CLM data enabled community-level analysis, fostering program advocacy and local collaboration. The authors created a diagram with CLM value change and its impact on the community and its topics to guide the presentation of the results: collect; analysis; local use (advocacy, collaboration); local change (programme redesign); and immediate outcomes (rapid response). In all data value topics, the results showed positive responses and perceptions from interviewees.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Among the strengths of the study, the importance of the theme of this study for the current context in prevention and health promotion actions in the field of HIV stands out. Studies using qualitative methodologies are of great importance and help to understand the perception of actors in the field. As a limitation of this article, I highlight the lack of a theoretical framework that guides the methodology and design of qualitative research.

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.

1. The abstract is well-written and coherently structured. However, the keywords need to be revised. Keywords presented on page 2 are different from those presented on page 6 (lines 20-21).
The research question that guides the article is also not presented in the Introduction. It is important that it is presented before the objective.

2. Topics such as "contribuition to the field" and "ethics statements" are satisfactorily presented.

3. The introduction presents a justification of very significant social relevance in the South African context. It is suggested to present references from other studies on the topic, in contexts other than just South Africa.

4. he methodology section presents some weaknesses that need to be reviewed by the authors. It is important that the authors bring the theoretical references of the study design. For example, what is the theoretical perspective that guides the choice of phenomenology? There is also no theoretical definition of the type of content analysis performed. Studies of a qualitative methodological nature are anchored in different theoretical perspectives, which is why it is essential to reference the theoretical choices in the methodology.
It is not clear in the article how the semi-structured interview script was prepared. The authors mention the components of the CLM Value Chain in a very generic way to justify the construction of the semi-structured interview script.

5. It is suggested that the beginning of the presentation of the results brings a characterization of the research participants, with information such as gender; area of professional activity; and professional performance time. Presentation in table format is ideal. And other information that the authors deem relevant for presenting the results.

6. On page 14, between lines 290 and 294, the authors highlight aspects inherent to qualitative research as limitations of the study, such as sample size and subjectivity. It is important to emphasize that these are not limiting aspects, but rather, inherent to qualitative research. I suggest a change in the limitations stated in the text of the article.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes, the title is appropriate.

Q 5 **Are the keywords appropriate?**

It is important to review the keywords. The following terms were not found in MeSH database: community-led data value chain, program implementation, steakholder percpetions.

Keywords presented on page 2 are different from those presented on page 6 (lines 20-21).

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

Yes, it is appropriate.

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, it is appropriate.

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:**

Major revisions.