

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Understanding the Risk Factors, Burden, and Interventions for Chronic Respiratory Diseases in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Rafaella Moreira

Submitted on: 28 Aug 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1607339

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The theme of "Climate Change Implications in Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease and Asthma in Low- and Middle-Income Countries" is significant. There is a gap in the literature on this topic that needs to be addressed.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The limitations include the use of limited databases, which means the authors could not include all relevant research on the topic. They correctly describe other limitations in their paper. However, the highlight is the importance of this theme in the current context.

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

- Introduction: The topics covered in the introduction are sufficient.
- Method: It is necessary to describe the details of the scoping review as recommended by the PRISMA extension for scoping reviews framework (PRISMA-SCR). For example:
 - You do not describe your review question. The PPC (population, concept, context) framework should be included.
 - Was the protocol registered in the Open Science Framework?
 - You selected only a few databases for your searches. Do you think these databases are sufficient, or might searching other databases yield additional relevant studies?
 - How do you define middle-income countries? You do not explain the selection criteria. Why do you cite middle-income countries and Sub-Saharan Africa separately as keywords?
- Results: I suggest presenting your results in a more dynamic form. Simply repeating the results presented in the tables is less engaging for readers. Consider using flowcharts and figures that illustrate connections between the data. You need to highlight the impact and innovation of your findings. Merely repeating the findings of other papers does not contribute significantly to the field. After that, you will need review your discussions and conclusions.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes, it does.

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 (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)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, the review is important in the global context of climate change and its implications for human health.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title needs to be revised to make it more attractive and appropriate for the journal.

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

No, they are not. There are too many keywords.

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes, it is.

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:

Major revisions.