

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Palliative Care Within the Primary Health Care Setting in Australia: A Scoping Review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Ana Cruz

Submitted on: 16 Jun 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2022.1604856

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

Palliative Care Within the Primary Health Care Setting in Australia

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations – national exercise on the subject of palliative care, the social context and health organization can be unique. the organization of the review is quite resumed, doesn't enable a deep knowledge on the subject.

strengths – the review is quite sintectic, allowing a quick view of the issues.

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

the review is quite interesting, it s a good description of the paliative care in Australia, with some of the particularities, like the detail of the payments, and dificulties by the some of the professionals. May i would recommend to do this type of comments for the different professionals, only if this is possilble, of course. Example: why do you say that the GP practise end-of-life care without recognizing it?

PLEASE COMMENT

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

yes, it seems adequate.

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 (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)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?

The review has national and international implications, is a good example to other countries to follow.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title seems appropriate, clearly reveals the aim of the article.

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

The keywords are suitable.

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, the language is clear.

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:

Accept.