

Peer Review Report

Review Report on An overview of Long COVID support services in Australia and international clinical guidelines, with a proposed care model in a global context

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Reviewer 1

Submitted on: 05 Jul 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2023.1606084

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

This article combine a review of the current long covid guidelines with the description of the long covid clinics in Australia and finally a proposed model for long covid prevention and management

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strengths: original and up-to-date theme, multidimensional study design

Limitations: guidelines review too general

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

I have some comments and recommendations for the Authors to improve their manuscript.

MAJOR COMMENTS

- 1) The proposed model seems an output of the study rather than an additional consideration, so I recommend taking it out from the discussion and including as a Results' piece. This would also allow to better contextualise the consumer engagement paragraph in the Methods section, that now would also need details on how the model was conceptualized (e.g. now reported at row 280–281 but would benefit of a clearer explanation)
- 2) At row 397 the Authors state that the guidelines review was a rapid one, for the first time in the paper. This should be made clear before, but in my opinion even a rapid review has to take into account the quality of the guidelines, as quality itself should be the main drive for a guideline inclusion rather than the reputation of the writing organization. So I recommend that a quality assessment of the selected guidelines is performed (e.g. AGREE II tool)

MINOR COMMENTS

- 1) G-I-N International guidelines repository may be also searched for guidelines
- 2) An additional quantitative table summarising the guidelines' characteristics would add value to the paper
- 3) Row 24 and 385: the possible use of AI may be better exemplified
- 4) Row 372 "indivial": typo?
- 5) The authors may wish to say something about the dismission and then re-activation of long covid services due to the intermittent trend of the number of covid cases

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 (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)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 but I would suggest rendering more explicit the fact that a proposed model is an output of the study

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



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.

