

Peer Review

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

Hany Akeel Al-hussaniy¹

1. University of Baghdad, Iraq

This commentary presents a well-structured and conceptually strong evaluation of the NHS Cervical Screening Programme (CSP) using the Health Belief Model (HBM) alongside global health promotion frameworks such as the Ottawa Charter. The manuscript's principal strength lies in its integrative theoretical approach, successfully linking behavioural science with public health policy analysis and highlighting inequities in screening participation across sociocultural and socioeconomic contexts. The use of contemporary national screening data strengthens the relevance and credibility of the arguments. Additionally, the discussion appropriately recognises ethical tensions between population-level prevention strategies and individual autonomy, which represents an important contribution to the cervical cancer prevention discourse. However, several aspects could be strengthened to enhance scholarly rigour. The methodology, while described as a systematic literature review, lacks sufficient detail regarding search strategy reproducibility, database coverage, study selection process, and quality appraisal of included sources. Furthermore, the critique of the HBM would benefit from comparison with alternative behavioural frameworks, such as the Theory of Planned Behavior or socio-ecological models, to provide a more comprehensive theoretical evaluation. The manuscript also relies heavily on UK-specific programmatic data, and inclusion of comparative international screening strategies could improve generalisability and policy relevance. Finally, while the recommendations are practical and policy-oriented, they would benefit from stronger evidence-based prioritisation and feasibility considerations. Overall, this commentary provides a valuable multidisciplinary perspective on cervical

cancer prevention but would be strengthened by deeper methodological transparency and broader theoretical contextualisation.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.