

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Factors influencing the implementation of remote delivery strategies for non-communicable disease care in low- and middle-income countries: a narrative review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Alain Amstutz

Submitted on: 10 Mar 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2022.1604583

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

This narrative review highlights factors influencing the implementation of remote NCD care in LMICs.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strengths:

- methods are sound and clear.
- result well presented
- comprehensive, well written manuscript

Limitations:

- setting focus unclear (see below)

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

Congratulations to the authors for this concise, comprehensive and very well written manuscript!

Minor comments:

- Explain abbreviation at first use, e.g. DM/HTN
- Figure 2: Double-check the numbers, some do not add up to the correct total (e.g. 210 + 333 is not 542)
- line 151: Screening approach: Note if conference abstracts were also screened. Did the authors apply any language restrictions (e.g. only english abstracts)? Please mention if any year restrictions were applied?
- Define "crisis-affected settings". What is a crisis in the view of the authors?

Major comment:

- The title and line 105 ("Setting") suggests that this is "a narrative review to inform care in humanitarian crises and other settings of health system disruption"
-> However, most included studies are not from such a setting (e.g. rural South Africa) but they report on settings with common/prevalent/ongoing structural barriers, i.e. difficult access to health centers, costs associated with transport, general shortage of nurses/clinicians. Not because of a humanitarian crisis.

I understand that the strategies are similar for both settings, but differentiated service delivery is becoming the standard in LMIC even if there is no humanitarian crisis or health system disruption – just because of the ongoing structural barriers. Would advice the authors to rephrase title and clarify that the review has a broader view and is relevant for a broader setting. The authors explain it in the last paragraph of background and discussion, but they may want to be more consistent throughout manuscript (incl. title). In my view, broadening the setting will make the manuscript even stronger and relevant for more stakeholders.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

yes

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?

limited

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

should be improved, see above

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes

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.