

CORRESPONDENCE

Open Access



Methodological rigor in climate-resilient health systems research: from criticism to contribution

Ali Mohammad Mosadeghrad¹, Parvaneh Isfahani², Leila Eslambolchi¹, Maryam Zahmatkesh³ and Mahnaz Afshari^{4*}

Keywords Critical appraisal, Scoping reviews, Systematic reviews

Dear editor

In our recent article titled “Strategies to strengthen a climate-resilient health system: A scoping review” in the BMC Globalization and Health journal, we embarked on an extensive review of literature, guided by the Arksey and O’Malley scoping review protocol [1]. Through a meticulous search of six diverse databases, we successfully identified 87 strategies to strengthen the climate resilience of the health system. These strategies were organized into the six pillars of health systems: governance and leadership; financing; workforce; medical products, and technologies; information systems; and service delivery. Furthermore, we proposed a conceptual framework to strengthen a climate resilience health system [2].

The editor of BMC Globalization and Health journal informed us about some critical views on our article through a letter to the editor, titled as “Methodological Concerns in the Published Article in Globalization and Health: A Critical Evaluation”. We do value scholarly

discourse and constructive feedback, however, here, we found it necessary to reply to the points mentioned in this letter to address the raised methodological concerns.

The first point is that we used Iranian databases in our search strategy which might have affected the comprehensiveness and fairness of the review. It is worth to note that the aim of a scoping review is to map key concepts of a research area rapidly and comprehensively. Therefore, our research was underpinned by an inclusive database selection strategy that incorporated both international (Web of Science, PubMed, Scopus, and EMBASE) and Persian (Scientific Information Database and Magiran) databases, supplemented by Google Scholar search engine. This expansive search strategy was instrumental in uncovering a broader spectrum of solutions to strengthen the health system’s climate resilience than if we had limited our search to English-language databases exclusively. The implication that our study was confined to Iranian contexts is factually incorrect, as illustrated by the geographical distribution of studies presented [2], which spans all six WHO regions.

The second point is the lack of clarity in the methodology regarding eligibility criteria, and data extraction. Again, we draw readers’ attention to the point that our study is a scoping review which is methodologically different from a systematic review. While systematic reviews require the tabulation of each retrieved article’s main characteristics, scoping reviews do not share this obligation. Instead, scoping reviews aim to explore the

*Correspondence:

Mahnaz Afshari
mahnazafshar89@gmail.com

¹Health Economics and Management Department, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran

²School of Public Health, Zabol University of Medical Sciences, Zabol, Iran

³School of Business and Management, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, England

⁴School of Nursing and Midwifery, Saveh University of Medical Sciences, Saveh, Iran



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article’s Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Table 1 Characteristics of scoping reviews and systematic reviews [3]

	Scoping reviews	Systematic reviews
A priori review protocol	Yes (some)	Yes
PROSPERO registration of the review protocol	No	Yes
Explicit, transparent, peer reviewed search strategy	Yes	Yes
Standardized data extraction forms	Yes	Yes
Mandatory Critical Appraisal (Risk of Bias Assessment)	No	Yes
Synthesis of findings from individual studies and the generation of 'summary' findings	No	Yes

scope and the breadth of literature, clarify concepts, identify gaps, and inform future research priorities [1, 3], as was our objective. We applied the PRISMA flow diagram to enhance transparency in our data extraction process. This should not be misconstrued as a shift towards systematic review protocols. As such, registration in PROSPERO, a registry for systematic reviews, was not necessary for our scoping review, which adhered to the Arksey and O'Malley protocol [1]. The distinction between the scoping and systematic reviews is paramount (Table 1). Scoping reviews serve to chart the landscape of existing literature on a given topic, and address a broader research question, while systematic reviews delve into answering specific questions, often with a pre-defined scope and stringent quality appraisal of included studies. Our scoping review was a precursor to systematic reviews, setting the stage for subsequent, more focused inquiries.

We stand by the robustness of our methodology and the validity of our findings. We believe that our research provides a valuable contribution to the field and serves as a solid foundation for future studies aimed at strengthening the resilience of health systems in the face of global climate change. In closing, critical appraisal should be a comprehensive examination, encompassing all facets of a study, from its introduction and methodology to its findings, discussion, and conclusion. A critic should engage with the study holistically, and when necessary, directly communicate with the authors to resolve any issues constructively. This ensures that critiques are not only scientifically grounded but also contribute productively to the academic dialogue.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Author contributions

All authors drafted the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable.

Data availability

Not applicable.

Declarations**Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Received: 30 November 2023 / Accepted: 30 November 2023

Published online: 14 December 2023

References

1. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol*. 2005;8(1):19–32.
2. Mosadeghrad AM, Isfahani P, Eslambolchi L, Zahmatkesh M, Afshari M. Strategies to strengthen a climate-resilient health system: a scoping review. *Global Health*. 2023;19(1):62.
3. Munn Z, Peters MD, Stern C, Tufanaru C, McArthur A, Aromataris E. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2018;18:1–7.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.