

Peer Review Report

Review Report on A narrative review of innovative responses during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Rene Amalberti

Submitted on: 20 Aug 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604652

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The article deals with innovations of all kinds that have occurred in the healthcare system during the COVID crisis

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strengths:

I appreciate the way the literature review has been conducted

The number and relevance of references included into the review are good

The analysis and semantic extraction of citations of specific innovations in articles is rigorous.

The paper is easy to read, comprehensive and well-illustrated.

The taxonomy of innovations with the 6 classes proposed at the end makes sense and largely overlaps with the publications already proposed on the subject.

Limitations:

The proposed material remains a 'flat sorting' based on the nature and frequency of citations where all the innovations are considered as potentially equivalent. The article does not provide any hierarchy of value of these innovations for the benefit of healthcare.

- This is clearly due to the methodology adopted by authors based on the capture of anecdotal evidence of innovations. This method is relevant for counting evidence, but limited for many other aspects. I regret that there is no scientific evaluation of innovations in most cases (no available into papers? not systematic?). It is therefore difficult to say whether these innovations are (1) as effective for performance and for safety as the normal recommended procedures (an interesting point to be debated for further use (2) have a lasting value, or just occasional for the health system

Another negative point concerns the discussion and lessons learned from this review

- Will the innovations of one crisis be those of the next crisis, especially if the conditions of the crisis are different. The lessons to be learned are perhaps more at the level of the system's capacity and characteristics for learning and adapting innovation in times of crisis, than on the listing of innovations themselves.
- And also important to say something on how professionals have eliminated non-applicable innovations over time (a subject not mentioned in the article but the number of which may be greater than the good innovations)

Please elaborate on these points

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

Major comments

In all, it is a good and valuable descriptive work on innovations in the times of COVID. However, I regret that the paper lacks hindsight, analysis and lessons particularly for a publication in a public health Journal. It is undoubtedly possible for the authors to improve this defect and complete the manuscript in this direction.

Minor comments

Many assertions here and there are too general

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes

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?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13	Quality of generalization and summary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 14	Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 15	Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 16	Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.