

Peer Review

Review of: "Protocol: A Systematic Review of Multi-Sectoral Coordination during the COVID-19 Pandemic—Practices, Challenges, and Recommendations for Future Preparedness"

Nkolika P. Uguru¹

1. University of Nigeria, Nigeria

REVIEW: Protocol: A Systematic Review of Multi-Sectoral Coordination during the COVID-19 Pandemic—Practices, Challenges, and Recommendations for Future Preparedness

Reviewer Comments:

Abstract section:

After the abstract, the strengths and weaknesses section seems to be a duplication of information in the summary section. The strengths and limitations should be removed from the abstract section and harmonized with what is obtainable in the Summary section.

Key messages or key findings can replace strengths and limitations after the abstract section.

SECTION 2.4: Selection process: The authors mentioned that three independent reviewers will complete the review process. Why did they mention further in that section that disputes amongst the reviewers will be referred to a third reviewer? Shouldn't it be to a fourth?

Will any information obtained from the pilot be included in the review? Or is the pilot merely for the adjustment of the data collection tool?

Subgroup/sensitivity analysis: Is Kenya alone a good representation of all LMICs? A group of countries representing each sub-region in Africa would have been better.

Dissemination strategies:

It would be important to include policy briefs and blogs since this article has a policy focus.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.