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EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The topic of this paper is the use of qualitative methodology in the study of urban health. I think it is an absolutely pertinent topic to address and study.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations:
- The abstract could have included the main qualitative techniques studied, at least having mentioned the most important ones.
- Within discourse analysis techniques, critical discourse analysis and constructivist grounded theory are missing.
- The focus group is a very important technique in the study of urban health. In my opinion, it is given very little importance in this paper.
- The discussion focuses only on the generality of results from qualitative methodology, when I do not think it is a relevant issue because qualitative methodology provides other things. I think the discussion could have been focused differently.

Strengths:
- The topic is very pertinent
- The contributions of the qualitative methodology to urban health research are analyzed.
- All qualitative techniques are analyzed, from the most traditional to the most recent.
- Discourse analysis techniques are also discussed. I think that analysis is a valuable contribution.

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

Dear authors:
I think it is a necessary manuscript, that the topic is relevant and that in general it is very complete (it addresses all qualitative techniques as well as the main discourse analysis theories).
However, I believe that some aspects of the manuscript could be improved:
- The abstract would have to include the main qualitative techniques studied, at least having mentioned the most important ones.
- Within discourse analysis techniques, critical discourse analysis and constructivist grounded theory are missing. I think the authors would have to include them.
- The focus group is a very important technique in the study of urban health. In my opinion, it is given very little importance in this paper. I think that more should be said about the contributions of focus groups to urban health research.
- The discussion focuses only on the generality of results from qualitative methodology, when I do not think it is a relevant issue because qualitative methodology provides other things. I think the discussion would have to include the most important contributions of qualitative methodology compared to quantitative methodology, as well as the possible shortcomings that said methodology may have. I suggest the following papers: – Rivera Navarro J, Franco Tejero M, Conde Espejo P, Sandín Vázquez M, Gutiérrez Sastre M, Cebrecos A, Sainz Muñoz

...

**PLEASE COMMENT**

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

In general, the bibliographic review is very complete. There are some references missing that I have already mentioned before.

**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?

This publication has a global impact because qualitative methodology has universal application in health sciences.

**Q 9** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, I consider the title very appropriate, concise and attractive

**Q 10** Are the keywords appropriate?

Keywords are appropriate, but Focus groups are missing

**Q 11** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, the english language is of sufficient quality.

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

Yes.
QUALITY ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 13</th>
<th>Quality of generalization and summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 14</th>
<th>Significance to the field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 15</th>
<th>Interest to a general audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 16</th>
<th>Quality of the writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVISION LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 17</th>
<th>Please take a decision based on your comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major revisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>