

Peer Review Report

Review Report on The health and health insurance implications of climate change in sub-Saharan Africa: A narrative review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: António Machado

Submitted on: 01 Jun 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1607212

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

It is a very interesting work about the effects and implications of climate change on the population of sub-Saharan Africa.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

It is a relevant research topic but no vast research seems to be realized by the authors.

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

Reviewer report of the Manuscript ID 1607212

Congratulations on the present systematic review! It is a very interesting work about the effects and implications of climate change on the population of sub-Saharan Africa.

General comments

The manuscript is well-written, and, in my opinion, no major English editing is needed. However, I found some errors that need some attention. Please see my comments below.

The present manuscript is titled as a systematic review. However, the present work analyzed a question more likely for a scoping review, which is typically broader than that of a traditional systematic review. Scoping reviews may include multiple types of evidence (i.e. different research methodologies, primary research, reviews, and non-empirical evidence). The systematic review usually used original articles.

The authors need to realize major revisions of the present study. I recommended using: <https://www.prisma-statement.org/scoping>

Minor comments

Methods

Lines 6–7 on page 4– Please properly cite PRISMA guidelines. For example, the following citation or another one of the authors' preferences:

Selcuk AA. A Guide for Systematic Reviews: PRISMA. Turkish Arch Otorhinolaryngol. 2019;57: 57–58. pmid:31049257

There is missing information in the manuscript. Please revise: <https://prisma.shinyapps.io/checklist/>

Please add the “data extraction and quality assessment” realized by the authors indicating the authors that extracted all data and the authors that validated and approved the selection and assessment.

Results

Figure 1 needs to be rectified, indicating the total papers obtained, the search databases, exclusion. Also, the percentage illustrated had a comma instead of a dot.

Please check:

<https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4/figures/1>

Graphs 1 and 2 are figures. Please rectify them.

Graph 1 should not show diseases in the italic form since no microbial names are cited.

Table 1. When exploring various databases for systematic reviews and other pertinent sources, many researchers wonder if can include reviews in a systematic review. However, it is not advisable to include them

in a systematic review, but the authors can include the primary studies that were evaluated in previous (systematic) reviews.

If the authors do not want to pursue a scoping review or systematic review. I recommended the authors merely change the title for a normal and standard review.

No numerical data is reported by the authors and all shown results are too vague. It is not possible to consider the present work as a systematic review, in my opinion. In addition, the narrative seems more like a classical review with opinions about trends in the searched literature.

Discussion

Too short and no specific discussion is made of the different countries belonging to sub-Saharan Africa. It must be improved.

Conclusion

No shortcomings or limitations are acknowledged by the authors.

Funding

The grant number is missing in the Funding section.

References

For a review, the authors merely showed 30 references, and no deep analysis seems to be realized.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

No. For a review, the authors merely showed 30 references, and no deep analysis seems to be realized.

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

No.

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?

Yes.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

No, it is not a standard systematic review.

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?

No.

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.