

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Emerging Health Care Leaders: lessons from a novel leadership and community-building program

Policy Brief, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Suzanne Babich

Submitted on: 16 Feb 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1606794

EVALUATION

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

Authors find that:

*Public health education needs to be reformed but that programs targeting leadership training for emerging leaders is uncoordinated; thus programs with similar missions around the world cannot learn from each other.

*The authors share some lessons learned from a Switzerland-based EHCL program.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and advantages.

Limitations:

The paper is presented as a "policy brief," but it strikes me more as a perspective piece. I am unclear as to whether this is positioned this way as a matter of practicality, given the organization of this journal, or whether it really means to present itself as a systematic analysis. The paper sets out a brief statement about the continuing need for leadership training for public health professionals and it describes some such programs around the world. However, the review is incomplete and misses a number of longstanding programs in North America, Europe and Africa. It then goes on to share some impressions from one Swiss program. However, the information is superficial and presented in a very long block of unbroken text that is difficult for the reader to digest in its current form. It seems as though it would be more effective if some evaluation data from the program could be presented in tables or figures and then lessons learned summarized.

Advantages: Important topic that adds to the global discourse; disseminates descriptive information about one European leadership training program.

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

As noted earlier, the description of leadership training programs is incomplete and misses a number of longstanding programs in North America Europe and Africa. Information about a Swiss program is shared, but it is difficult to digest in its long narrative form with unbroken text. It would be more effective to include some data about the program shown in tables or figures. As it is, the presentation seems superficial to this reviewer, or based on scant evaluation data.

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?

No.

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):

The paper does well to raise awareness about an important fact, that globally we do not do enough to coordinate and share lessons learned from our varied efforts at providing leadership training to public health practitioners. As written, though, this paper seems, to this reviewer, to be more of a perspective piece than a policy brief or scholarly paper.

The paper sets out a brief statement about the continuing need for leadership training for public health professionals and it describes some such programs around the world. However, the discussion appears to be incomplete in that it misses a number of longstanding programs in North America , Europe and Africa. The paper might be strengthened by including a more comprehensive list of such programs, perhaps organizing them in a table or figure. With a little more information about these programs, this could help the reader envision the basic characteristics and even the geographic distribution of such programs. The paper shares some impressions from one Swiss program. However, the information appears to this reviewer to be somewhat superficial and presented in a very long block of unbroken text that is difficult for the reader to digest. It might be more effective if some evaluation data from the program could be presented in tables or figures and then lessons learned summarized.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Q 6 Originality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Q 7 Rigor | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Q 8 Significance to the field | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Q 9 Interest to a general audience | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Q 10 Quality of the writing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Q 11 Overall quality of the study | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

REVISION LEVEL

Q 12 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.