Review of: "Reassessing Cervical Cancer Prevention: Evaluating the NHS Cervical Cancer Screening Programme Through the Health Belief Model and Global Health Promotion Strategies"

Koray Çelebi[1]

1 Independent researcher

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Peer Review: "Reassessing Cervical Cancer Prevention: Evaluating the NHS Cervical Cancer Screening Programme Through the Health Belief Model and Global Health Promotion Strategies"

This article presents a comprehensive evaluation of the NHS Cervical Cancer Screening Programme (CSP) through the lens of the Health Belief Model (HBM) and broader global health promotion strategies. Below, I provide a detailed review, highlighting both strengths and areas for improvement.

Strengths:

Thorough Examination: The author does a commendable job of analyzing the Cervical Screening Programme in the UK using the HBM. The use of key concepts like susceptibility, severity, and perceived benefits/barriers adds depth to the discussion. Additionally, the integration of global health strategies, such as the Ottawa Charter, broadens the article's relevance.

Well-Structured Methodology: The literature review is systematic and draws on up-to-date sources, including the 2022-2023 Cervical Screening Standards Data Report. The approach is methodologically sound, making the conclusions well-grounded.

Policy-Relevant Recommendations: The article goes beyond critique by offering practical suggestions for policymakers, such as targeted interventions for underserved groups. This aspect enhances the paper's real-world impact.

Areas for Improvement:

Limited Original Data: While the literature review is solid, the article does not offer any new empirical data or primary research. Including a small qualitative study, perhaps patient interviews or surveys, could enhance the originality and strengthen the findings.

Balancing Critique of the HBM: The focus on the limitations of the HBM is valid, but the discussion could be enriched by exploring alternative models of health behavior, such as the Social Cognitive Theory. This would provide a more balanced

critique and offer potential solutions to the limitations identified within the HBM.

Cultural Sensitivity: While cultural barriers are discussed, the article could benefit from more specific examples of how these barriers affect different communities. Including case studies or research specific to immigrant populations or rural vs. urban populations in the UK would add depth to the cultural analysis.

Ethical Considerations: The article touches on ethical issues but could expand its discussion, particularly around patient autonomy and the balance between public health goals and individual rights. A more thorough exploration of these ethical dilemmas would strengthen this section.

Connection to Global Health Promotion Frameworks: The Ottawa Charter is mentioned, but its application to the CSP is somewhat superficial. A deeper exploration of how the Charter's five action pillars—especially community action and supportive environments—apply to the UK screening program would help to ground the paper in global health promotion frameworks.

Flow and Readability: Some transitions between sections, particularly from methodology to critique, feel abrupt. Smoother transitions would improve readability and make the paper more cohesive.

Sociodemographic Factors: While the article mentions disparities in screening uptake, a more detailed examination of how factors such as ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and education level affect participation would enhance the paper's impact. A section focused on intersectionality would be beneficial.

Specific Future Research Recommendations: The article makes general recommendations for future research, but these could be more specific. For example, suggesting longitudinal studies on the integration of HPV vaccination and screening programs or qualitative studies on the cultural factors affecting screening behaviors would be useful.

Conclusion:

Overall, this article provides a valuable critique of the NHS Cervical Screening Programme, with strong recommendations for improving equity and effectiveness. With a bit more focus on alternative health behavior models, detailed cultural analysis, and an expanded discussion of ethics, it has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field of public health.