

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Improving the pharmacists' response to public health emergencies – documentary research on online resources provided by national pharmacists' associations

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Astrid Czock

Submitted on: 14 Nov 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604537

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study compares websites of 7 national pharmacy associations in Europe, USA and Australia. From the analysis of the content of the websites, the authors make recommendations to national pharmacy associations for preparedness and response in public health emergency situations. These recommendations concern the training of pharmacists and the communication to pharmacists during a public health emergency.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strengths:

The authors not only consider patients and the provision of services as important, but also the pharmacists' self-care in mental health in order to be resilient.

Limitations:

- The analysis of the official website of a national professional society does not comprise all resources a national pharmacy society provides for its members, so information is limited to the public access.
- there is selection bias, as only one association / organisation per country is considered in the study, while many of the mentioned countries have several professional associations / organisations
- The criteria for the choice of the countries is not clearly described, which gives room to selection bias
- the limitation stated by the authors is valid, but the statement that they as pharmacists and scholars know what is important is another strong bias (no scientifically sound validity)

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The sample size is very low, in order to be representative, considering that fip has 147 member organisations. Important references are not considered (e.g. fip Responding to disaster: Guidelines for pharmacy 2016, The Hague: International Pharmaceutical Federation, 2016).

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title does not necessarily fit to the objective of the study. The title as it is might be misleading as I expect a different content -

Possible, more fitting titles:

The Role of the national pharmaceutical association in public health emergencies

Recommendations for public health emergency preparedness for national professional societies

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

The key words can be more appropriate.
missing keywords are:
national pharmaceutical / pharmacy association
preparedness and reponse
recommendations for training and communication

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, with some small, correctable mistakes (e.g. line 148)

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

Yes.

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

As stated in the limitations, only one national organisation is considered, so there is consequently also a selection bias in the references. There does not seem any bias in the references, but very important references are missing:

- International Pharmaceutical Federation (FIP) Responding to disaster: Guidelines for pharmacy 2016, The Hague: International Pharmaceutical Federation, 2016
- International Pharmaceutical Federation FIP STATEMENT OF POLICY: Role of the pharmacist in disaster management, The Hague, 2017
- Aruru M. et al. Pharmacy Emergency Preparedness and Response (PEPR): a proposed framework for expanding pharmacy professionals' roles and contributions to emergency preparedness and response during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond, Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy 17 (2021) 1967-1977, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2020.04.002>
- FIP Covid-19 Information Hub "Ressources from other Organisations"
<https://www.fip.org/coronavirus#resources-from-fip-mos> (accessed Nov 14, 2021)
- Chan et al. Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice (2020) 13:13, Together we unite: the role of the Commonwealth in achieving universal health coverage through pharmaceutical care amidst the COVID-19 pandemic, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40545-020-00214-6>

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11 Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 12 Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.

