

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Coproducing Quality and Safety Improvement Projects in Resource-Constrained Countries: Lessons from Mozambique

Original Article, Int. J. Public Health

Reviewer: Gabriel Gulis

Submitted on: 06 Nov 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2025.1607847

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study aims to describe quality improvement in hospital in low resource settings related to foreign aid and support. The description is done on rather essay as scientific paper level.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The strength of the manuscript is in its subject and location; indeed scientific literature lacks high quality papers demonstrating systematic and sustainable impact of foreign aid programs on Universal health coverage and quality of healthcare.

A major limitation of this manuscript is, that it does not provide that systematic impact evidence either! It is rather an essay in popular language as a scientific paper. There is no clearly formulated aim of the work (kind of research question) and the Method part is very general as well. The co-production part is rather vaguely described, it is mostly unclear who co-produced what.

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 comments:

- I miss a clear aim of the work! The paragraph in Introduction on lines 32-39 contains some statement, which could be the aim, but then the following text is not really related to it. For example you say "provide an overview of an innovative programme"; if that is the aim, where is the overview and what is innovative on it? Moreover, a overview of innovative programmes can not be considered a scientific manuscript.
- the Method part, lines 118-119 you write "this paper is a retrospective narrative, qualitative 119 and quantitative review of the programme". There is no methodological information neither on workshops, nor on selection of four case studies (e.g. why those four hospitals? how many others were involved), selection of indicators to measure success, potential effect modifiers/confounders?
- in Results, right by opening sentence you say "QI programme has had an impact on the Ministry of Health..." but how did you learn that? in Method part you wrote nothing about studying an impact on Ministry of health? Moreover, I do not see that impact demonstrated in Results. All results contain the four, relatively independent case studies.
- the Discussion part in principle repeats what was already written in Context and Results part, there is no critical discussion on selected case studies, indicators applied, potential confounders, time, etc...

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

In principle yes, it is definitively attractive. But it does not reflect what is in the manuscript! Or rather the opposite way, the manuscript provides little scientific knowledge on co-production (who and what) and quality and safety issues.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Except "implementation science" the keywords are fine. I do not see anything from implementation science in paper, no implementation theory applied, no clear outcomes presented.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes

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

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.