

Peer Review Report

Review Report on A scientometric analysis of Africa's health science journals indexed in international and regional databases: a comparative analysis

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: M Ahmed

Submitted on: 27 Sep 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606415

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study analyzed the citation impact, subject trends, and authorship collaboration patterns of African health science journals indexed in international and regional databases. The main findings of the study are:

1. African health science journals have a lower citation impact compared to journals from other regions.
2. African health science journals have a higher percentage of articles with African authors compared to other regions.
3. Subject trends in African health science journals include infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases, and maternal and child health.
4. Authorship collaboration patterns in African health science journals include intra-African collaboration and collaboration with international partners.

Overall, the study suggests that African health science journals face challenges in achieving global recognition and impact, but have the potential to foster collaboration within the African continent and with international partners. The study highlights the need for increased investment in African health science journals to improve their quality and visibility.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations:

1. The study only analyzed journals with online presence, excluding print-only journals, which may have limited the scope of the analysis.
2. The study only analyzed journals indexed in specific databases, which may not be representative of all African health science journals.
3. The study did not analyze the quality of the articles published in the journals, which may have affected the citation impact of the journals.

Strengths:

1. The study used a scientometric approach to analyze the citation impact, subject trends, and authorship collaboration patterns of African health science journals, which provides a quantitative and objective analysis.
2. The study used a sample of 62 journals indexed in international and regional databases, which provides a comprehensive analysis of the journals.
3. The study identified subject trends and authorship collaboration patterns, which provides insights into the research priorities and collaboration patterns of African health science journals.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Major Comments:

1. Methodology: The study only analyzed journals with online presence, excluding print-only journals, which may have limited the scope of the analysis. It is recommended to include print-only journals in future studies to provide a more comprehensive analysis of African health science journals.

2. Results: The study did not analyze the quality of the articles published in the journals, which may have affected the citation impact of the journals. It is recommended to include an analysis of the quality of the articles published in the journals in future studies.

3. Data Interpretation: The study suggests that African health science journals have a lower citation impact compared to journals from other regions. However, the study did not provide a comparison of the citation impact of African health science journals with journals from other developing regions. It is recommended to provide a comparison of the citation impact of African health science journals with journals from other developing regions to provide a more comprehensive analysis.

Minor Comments:

1. Methods: The study used a sample of 62 journals indexed in international and regional databases. It is recommended to provide a justification for the sample size and the choice of databases.

2. Results: The study identified subject trends in African health science journals, including infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases, and maternal and child health. It is recommended to provide a more detailed analysis of the subject trends, including the specific diseases and health issues covered in the journals.

3. References: The study cited several references to support the analysis. However, some of the references are outdated and may not reflect the current state of African health science journals. It is recommended to include more recent references to support the analysis.

Overall, the study provides valuable insights into the citation impact, subject trends, and authorship collaboration patterns of African health science journals. However, there are some limitations and areas for improvement that should be addressed in future studies.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

it is appropriate, concise but looks like a counting exercise.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11 Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 12 Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.