

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Screening for Unstable Housing in a Healthcare Setting

Mini Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Carole Upshur

Submitted on: 11 Aug 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2023.1606438

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The main theme of the manuscript is that housing affects health, and that homelessness is an important social determinant of health that should be screened for in health care settings. The authors then summarize studies that have reported the results of screening for homelessness and the strengths and limitations of such screening.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations are the lack of inclusion of any studies from other than the US. If a thorough search was conducted, then the authors should include in the title/abstract that they are summarizing US studies only. The authors should comment on the lack of sensitivity of the instruments for which those data are provided and link to method of administration if possible.

Strengths: Identification of relevant tools that may be used by health care.

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

This is a useful summary of screening tools used to assess housing stability among patients in health care settings.

A few revisions would strengthen the manuscript.

1) the abstract indicates the study is about screening in primary care and community health settings, but the actual settings described in the collected studies include in-patient, emergency rooms etc.

2) the authors could discuss a bit the sensitivity and specificity of the measures where these data were provided. It seems that the measures utilized lacked precision and some explanation in terms of self-administration vs interview etc might be helpful if that information is available.

3) It is surprising that the authors found no such studies in Europe, the UK, or other developed countries. I would imagine this is a flaw in the search process rather than absence of such screening. This needs to be discussed as a limitation.

4) it would be good to add to the table the setting in which the tool was administered. Also, the entry under Universal Homeless Housing Screening uses acronyms. that are not explained.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is not appropriate if only US tools are summarized and should be reworded.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

the key words seem appropriate and demonstrate that the use of health care generally brought in studies other than from primary care

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

No answer given.

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

yes except that no none US studies are included

Q 9 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 10 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 11 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 12 Does the review have international or global implications?

it could but only if studies outside of the US are added

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:

Major revisions.

