

Peer Review Report

Review Report on The intersections of COVID-19 global health governance and population health priorities: Equity-related lessons learned from Canada and selected G20 countries

Policy Brief, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Jeremy Youde

Submitted on: 14 Jun 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1606052

EVALUATION

Q 1 What are the main findings and conclusions reported in this manuscript?

In this article, the authors conduct a scoping review of COVID-19 policies from a number of G20 countries (including Canada) to examine which population health priorities rose to the top. They were particularly interested in questions about the relative prioritization of equity-related policies and the intersection between COVID-19 policies and marginalization, as well as examining how well global health governance procedures and institutions worked when put to the test in the midst of the pandemic. They found that global health governance systems lack sufficient resources to carry out their missions, that equity considerations need to be at the forefront of health policies, and that equity considerations need to go beyond the realm of health to engage the broader structural issues that create and maintain vulnerable populations in the first place.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and advantages.

The study is quite broad in its scope, which allowed the authors to engage with a large amount of recent literature. The authors are also very explicit about their methodology, making it quite possible to replicate their work and/or apply it to other areas.

The main limitation is that the breadth of the study's scope and the relatively short article length means that there is not a lot of space to dig into the details or provide concrete evidence to fully demonstrate that the authors' conclusions resonate with the evidence they found.

Q 3 Are there objective errors or fundamental flaws? If yes, please detail your concerns.

No fundamental flaws or objective errors noted

Q 4 Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Does the manuscript provide an appropriate context for a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Does the manuscript use language that can be understood by a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Is the quality of figures and/or tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Is the evidence presented appropriate, sound and objective?

Yes.

Are the action points provided based on the evidence?

Yes.

Are the action points provided reasonable and feasible?

Yes.

Are there any ethical issues with the recommendations provided?

No.

Q 5 Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

My main concern/query about the article relates to its framing. The authors position it as a study focused on "Canada and other G20 countries." In reading the article, though, there is relatively little that is Canada-specific. It makes me wonder whether framing it as Canada and other G20 countries is appropriate. Would it be better to frame it in terms of selected G20 countries? Or, as an alternative, should there be a more explicit focus on Canada with a secondary concern about other G20 countries? I'm agnostic as to the direction, but I expected more Canada-focused content and/or explicit comparisons between the Canadian experience and the experiences of other G20 countries.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 6 Originality



Q 7 Rigor



Q 8 Significance to the field



Q 9 Interest to a general audience



Q 10 Quality of the writing



Q 11 Overall quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 12 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.