

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Innovation in rural health services requires local actors and local action

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Cassiano Franco

Submitted on: 16 Jul 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2022.1604921

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main theme of the review.

Rural health and community participation

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

Limitations – The main limitation of the manuscript is the data presentation on the tables. The review has low evidence conclusions, due to the unique character of community participation initiatives and the scarcity of literature, but it is well addressed for the purposes of the review.

Strengths – Coherence and consistent analysis, with strong supportive literature.

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

Major comments:

The article is well structured, offering a comprehensive view of the research problem and its foundations. The methodology is well described in the steps of a scoping review, with consistent results and discussion. The presentation of data in tables can be improved.

Minor comments:

In the abstract, the objectives could be more directly addressed. Instead, the study questions are introduced. I suggest basing it on the first paragraph of the manuscript (lines 32 to 36).

All tables should have more complete titles. For example, in Table 1, roles and activities could include local actors for innovation processes in health services. Remember to include abbreviations legends (eg, R&D, in Table 3).

Table 1 would be better inserted after the explanation of the EPIS framework, in line 204. From the text, it is assumed that all phases of this framework should be included in the table, but only the exploration phase is described.

In the methods, in lines 217 and 218, the parentheses are dispensable.

In line 219, it is said that the analysis of the results was separated into two dimensions, lacking to explain them.

In lines 273 to 276, where there is a brief profile of the included studies, the period covered must be added. The authors could consider a table, with information about location, period and even methods or types of study.

Depending on the journal's requirements, Tables 2 and 3 could be combined into a single schematic figure, adding innovation theories, for a broader view of these findings.

In the discussion, lines 408 to 410 mention that 20 of 32 studies had health professionals identified as local actors, drawing attention to their dual roles. In dialogue with the authors, I think that the limits of community participation, assuming local providers as local actors, must be considered. The finding can be explored as low empowerment of users to more directly promote changes in services according to their perceived needs.

In lines 441 to 445, two points could be added to the discussion: a problematization on the inclusion of only high-income countries in the review and a greater distinction of the participation of small rural communities in health service innovation processes in contrast to urban contexts.

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?

Yes, as it addresses international research experiences on a topic of interest to all countries

**Q 9** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes.

**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?

No.

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.