

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Using qualitative methods to understand the interconnections between cities and health: a methodological review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Jesús Rivera Navarro

Submitted on: 24 Nov 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1606454

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The topic of this paper is the use of qualitative methodology in the study of urban health. I think it is an absolutely pertinent topic to address and study.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations:

- The abstract could have included the main qualitative techniques studied, at least having mentioned the most important ones.
- Within discourse analysis techniques, critical discourse analysis and constructivist grounded theory are missing.
- The focus group is a very important technique in the study of urban health. In my opinion, it is given very little importance in this paper.
- The discussion focuses only on the generality of results from qualitative methodology, when I do not think it is a relevant issue because qualitative methodology provides other things. I think the discussion could have been focused differently.

Strengths:

- The topic is very pertinent
- The contributions of the qualitative methodology to urban health research are analyzed.
- All qualitative techniques are analyzed, from the most traditional to the most recent.
- Discourse analysis techniques are also discussed. I think that analysis is a valuable contribution.

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

Dear authors:

I think it is a necessary manuscript., that the topic is relevant and that in general it is very complete (it addresses all qualitative techniques as well as the main discourse analysis theories).

However, I believe that some aspects of the manuscript could be improved:

- The abstract would have to include the main qualitative techniques studied, at least having mentioned the most important ones.
- Within discourse analysis techniques, critical discourse analysis and constructivist grounded theory are missing. I think the authors would have to include them.
- The focus group is a very important technique in the study of urban health. In my opinion, it is given very little importance in this paper. I think that more should be said about the contributions of focus groups to urban health research.
- The discussion focuses only on the generality of results from qualitative methodology, when I do not think it is a relevant issue because qualitative methodology provides other things. I think the discussion would have to include the most important contributions of qualitative methodology compared to quantitative methodology, as well as the possible shortcomings that said methodology may have. I suggest the following papers: - Rivera Navarro J, Franco Tejero M, Conde Espejo P, Sandín Vázquez M, Gutiérrez Sastre M, Cebrecos A, Sainz Muñoz

A, Gittelsohn J. Understanding urban health inequalities: methods and design of the Heart Health Hoods Qualitative Project. *Gaceta Sanitaria*, 2019. 33(6): 517–522. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaceta.2018.07.010> and - Jesús Rivera-Navarro, Paloma Conde, Julia Díez, Marta Gutiérrez-Sastre, Ignacio González-Salgado, María Sandín, Joel Gittelsohn y Manuel Franco (2021). Urban environment and dietary behaviours as perceived by residents living in socioeconomically diverse neighbourhoods: A qualitative study in a Mediterranean context. *Appetite*. 157: 104983. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2020.104983.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

In general, the bibliographic review is very complete. There are some references missing that I have already mentioned before.

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?

This publication has a global impact because qualitative methodology has universal application in health sciences.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, I consider the title very appropriate, concise and attractive

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Keywords are appropriate, but Focus groups are missing

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, the English language is of sufficient quality.

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:

Major revisions.