



SOUTH AFRICAN HEALTH REVIEW 2021

PEER REVIEWERS' GUIDELINES

Details of External Peer Reviewer

Name*		Reviewer No.	1
Affiliation			
Email		Contact Number	

**Please write your name as you would like it to appear in the acknowledgements. Titles are not printed.*

I acknowledge that I have read the SAHR Overview and Author Guidelines (attached) and Peer Review guidelines (below).

PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES

The purpose of peer review is to gauge the scientific validity, significance and originality of the research through critique that is collegial, constructive, critical, objective and balanced, and to suggest improvements to the manuscript. When specific criticisms are made, the reviewer should indicate precisely what the problems are and how they may be overcome. The peer evaluation should take into account the purpose of the SAHR and its readership as outlined herein.

Guiding principles responsibilities for peer reviewers

Availability: The reviewer should respond promptly to the request to review the manuscript and should submit his/her review within the agreed timeframe – usually within two to three weeks.

Expertise: The reviewer needs to assess whether s/he has the required expertise to evaluate the submission fairly and appropriately. If the reviewer challenges a point made by the authors, s/he should provide specific justification for the disagreement (e.g. literature citations).

Confidentiality: The SAHR follows a double blind review process. The reviewer should maintain confidentiality about the existence and content of the manuscript unless HST, through the SAHR editors, has authorised the use of the manuscript before publication.

The reviewer must not publicly discuss authors' work, nor should s/he copy, use or retain materials from the manuscript to advance his/her own work before the manuscript is published.

Conflict of Interests: The reviewer should declare his/her conflicts of interest and recuse him/ herself from the peer-review process if such conflict exists.

Reviewing is both a privilege and responsibility. It takes time to prepare a useful, critical review. The most important reward for you as a reviewer is your contribution to the quality of published paper.

Suspected misconduct: In cases where plagiarism or misconduct is suspected, please inform the editors immediately with as much justification as possible to support your suspicion.

Acknowledgements: Peer reviewers for the SAHR will be publically acknowledged and thanked in the preface of the edition to which they contributed.

Please complete all sections indicated. Additional comments may be provided where necessary. These guidelines contain 9 pages.

Title of Paper	
-----------------------	--

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW AND GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

1. What are the main points/ key messages conveyed by this manuscript?

<p>Comments</p>

2. What are your general impressions of the paper?

<p>Comments</p>

SECTION 2: RELEVANCE

1. Significance

- Is the paper significant? Does it contribute to building a body of knowledge of the public health sector in South Africa?

Comments

2. Insights/ new thinking

- Does the paper provide fresh insights into health systems strengthening efforts in the country?

Comments

3. COVID-19 focus

- a. In what way does the paper contribute to our understanding of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the South African Health System and the health-sector's response to this crisis?

Comments

- b. What emerging lessons are highlighted for the future management and prevention of pandemics and other public health emergencies?

Comments

4. Sources

- Are the sources authoritative and balanced? For example, have peer-reviewed journals been consulted or was there a heavy reliance on grey literature? Did the paper use journals and articles written by South Africans on the subject? Do the sources adequately support the information presented?

Comments

5. Recommendations

- Does the paper deal adequately with lessons learnt and recommendations?
- Do the recommendations support the desired transformation of the South Africa health system?
- Are they specific, relevant and practical?
- Do they stimulate further research in this area?

Comments

SECTION 3: COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE

1. Title

- Is the title appropriate? Does it accurately describe the focus of the article?
- Is it clear and succinct?

Comments

3. Structure

- Is the article well-structured and clearly and concisely written?
- Is the argument or research question addressed clearly up front?

- Can the reader follow the main theme explicitly and coherently throughout the article?

Comments

4. Scientific Rigour

- Does the paper demonstrate scientific rigour and intellectual clarity?

Comments

4. Conclusions

- Are the conclusions supported by the data reviewed and presented in a clear and concise manner?
- Are the findings/ implications of the study clearly and concisely summarised?

Comments

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL ELEMENTS

1. Abstract

- Does the abstract clearly state the objectives of the paper and provide an accurate and concise overview of its content? **YES/ NO**

Comments

2. Figures and tables

- Have tables and graphs been used appropriately?
- Are they clear and necessary - do they add to the analysis?

Comments

3. References

- Are these complete and comprehensive? **YES/ NO**
- Has the Vancouver style of referencing been appropriately applied? **YES/ NO**

Comments

4. Language

- Is extensive language editing required? **YES/ NO**

Comments

5. Keywords

- Are the keywords suggested accurate and appropriate? **YES/ NO**

Suggested changes

SECTION 5: FOR RESEARCH PAPERS (AS RELEVANT)

If not relevant, please go to Section 6

1. Research methods and study design

Points to consider:

- Has the research question has been clearly stated and defined?
- Have the research methods been satisfactorily described and are they appropriate to the study objectives?

- Is the process of data collection clear?
- Has the sample been adequately described?
- Have statistical methods been appropriately applied?
- Have the authors attempted to retrieve missing data (where applicable)?
- Have research methods raise any ethical concerns?

Comments

2. Analysis/ Data synthesis

Points to consider:

- Has the data has been clearly presented and comprehensively examined?
- Is there evidence of insightful interpretation of the data?
- Have all the research objectives been adequately considered in the interpretation?
- Does the data reflect the true picture in the country?
- Do the authors point out the gaps in the data (if any)?
- The most current data is presented?
- There is no key data that have been missed?
- Has the appropriate sub-group analyses has been carried out and reported correctly?
- Is specific input needed from a statistician?

Comments

3. Findings

Points to consider:

- Are the research findings clearly presented?
- Has the research question been adequately addressed?

- Are the research findings credible?
- Have the implications of the findings been thoroughly discussed?
- Is missing information regarding the findings described?
- Is the amount of missing information large enough to undermine the validity of the paper?
- Were (data) limitations and inconsistencies stated or discussed?

Comments

SECTION 6: PEER REVIEWER'S RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Please indicate in the check box if:

- Major revision is needed
- Minor revision is needed
- The manuscript can be accepted without revision
- The manuscript should be revised as a short (opinion/perspective/
lessons learnt) piece
- The manuscript is not acceptable for publication (even with major revision)

2. Do you have any further suggestions for how this paper can be improved?

Comments

3. Please indicate here in the check box if:

- You would like to receive the author's response to your feedback
- You would like to see the revised paper

DATE	
------	--

Please save the file as follows: short/ abbreviated Title of Chapter_
SAHR_ExternalPeerReview_REPORT_dayJune2021_Reviewer1_Surname of
Reviewer

Thank you for your input.

SAHR editors