

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on | Page Collaborations and Networks within Communities for improved utilization of primary healthcare centers: On the Road to Universal Health Coverage

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Bijit Biswas

Submitted on: 31 Jan 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606810

### EVALUATION

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

The study examined the benefits, challenges, and strategies for effective collaborations and networking for UHC using qualitative data and provided practical recommendations for stakeholders.

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

A major limitation of the study is that the study purely looked at horizontal collaborations within the 270 community without involving the government. Future studies can include vertical collaborations that 271 occur in communities.

#### 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.

There are grammatical errors in the manuscript. Everything should be in past tense. (i.e. A major limitation of the study is that the study purely looked at horizontal collaborations within the 270 community without involving the government. Future studies can include vertical collaborations that 271 occur in communities.)

Consider using some qualitative data analysis software to draw meaningful inferences from the study rather than manual analysis.

### PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes

#### Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

No, Kindly use MeSH terms.

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

No, Grammatical Errors were there.

#### 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**

**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.