

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

Murat Emin Güveli¹

¹ İstanbul University, Turkey

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

As a peer reviewer, I will offer constructive feedback on the manuscript titled "*Reassessing Cervical Cancer Prevention: Evaluating the NHS Cervical Cancer Screening Programme Through the Health Belief Model and Global Health Promotion Strategies*." I will humanize my observations to ensure clarity and a supportive tone.

Strengths:

- The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of the NHS Cervical Screening Programme (CSP) through a well-established theoretical lens, the Health Belief Model (HBM). This theoretical framework is used effectively to dissect the individual factors influencing participation in cervical screening.
- I appreciate the paper's emphasis on the broader determinants of health, such as socioeconomic and cultural barriers. This critical perspective adds depth to the discussion on how inequities in health access affect screening outcomes.
- The recommendations for policymakers are insightful, particularly the call for more culturally tailored interventions and the suggestion to integrate social determinants into health models.
- The use of recent data, such as the 2022-2023 Cervical Screening Standards Data Report, is commendable and strengthens the manuscript's relevance to contemporary healthcare challenges.

Areas for Improvement:

Clarity and Flow: While the manuscript covers key concepts, some sections could benefit from clearer transitions between ideas. For instance, when moving from the analysis of the HBM to the critique of the CSP's shortcomings, a stronger linking paragraph could help guide the reader. Clarifying how the Ottawa Charter principles are interwoven into this critique would also enhance coherence.

Cultural Sensitivity: The paper makes important points about cultural barriers but could explore more specific examples to better illustrate the point. For example, providing detailed examples of how certain cultural or religious beliefs (like those among Muslim and Somali women) interact with screening behaviors would provide a more nuanced understanding.

Health Promotion Models: While the Ottawa Charter is referenced, the analysis could benefit from more detailed integration of its principles into the discussion. How could the CSP be improved to align better with all five pillars of the

Ottawa Charter, not just policy and supportive environments? Expanding on this could strengthen the policy recommendations.

Ethical Considerations: The critique of the HBM and its potential to place undue responsibility on individuals is compelling, but the manuscript could explore ethical concerns in more depth. A discussion on how to balance public health goals with respect for individual autonomy would enrich the manuscript's ethical perspective.

Study Limitations: Although the paper mentions limitations, it could be helpful to expand on these. For instance, the reliance on secondary data could introduce certain biases or prevent the capture of recent programmatic adjustments. Acknowledging this limitation more explicitly would provide a balanced view.

Recommendations for Future Research: The suggestion to explore new screening technologies is a strong recommendation. However, the paper could also benefit from mentioning the potential role of artificial intelligence in improving cervical cancer detection and reducing healthcare disparities. This would align with global trends in health innovation.

Conclusion: Overall, the manuscript addresses a critical public health issue and provides valuable insights for improving cervical cancer prevention strategies in the UK. With some revisions focused on clarity, cultural sensitivity, and a deeper exploration of ethical implications, this paper has the potential to contribute significantly to the discourse on health promotion and cancer prevention.

I hope these suggestions help refine the manuscript for publication. The research is timely and addresses key gaps in current health promotion strategies.