PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Characterising performance information use in the primary health care systems of El Salvador, Lebanon, and Malawi: Multiple qualitative case study protocol
AUTHORS	Munar, Wolfgang; Wahid, Syed; Makwero, Martha; El-Jardali, Fadi; Dullie, Luckson; Yang, Wen-Chien

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Lawson, Henry University of Ghana
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Feb-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	This manuscript is written in the format of a proposal. A lot of future tense is used. There are no results, discussion, conclusion
	or recommendations. No limitations were discussed

REVIEWER	Villar-Uribe , Manuela World Bank Group
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Jun-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the invitation to review this manuscript. It is an excellent idea for a study, is well written and formulated on a well developed theoretical framework. The protocol is highly relevant and timely.
	The selection of countries for inclusion in the study, will provide for a very useful perspective across contexts and levels of PHC measurement strategy implementation. The proposed sampling strategy and sample size across countries is likely to be sufficient but the authors should be aware of the multiple efforts and stakeholders involved in PHC measurement in Malawi and account for a potential larger sample size. I suggest that the authors more explicitly mention how interviews will include respondents that represent different actors in the data generation, processing, analysis and decision-making process; it will be important to elucidate the role of data use by those that generate the data, those that compile it and those that receive it in an aggregated manner for policy making.
	The authors should also consider and plan, in their data collection strategy, for a methodology to define primary health care in each country as well as performance and its measures, to ensure a comparability across respondents. The definition of PHC is very often not uniform across countries or within countries, hence a common definition at least among respondents in each country is likely to allow for comparisons and understanding of

commonalities across respondents. The mentioned routine health information systems most often do not actually provide strong measures of PHC performance as no denominators are available for contrasting service delivery volumes with need; a clear definition of PHC performance measures will likely help consolidate findings across respondents.
Incorporation of these abovementioned considerations will make the protocol and study stronger and more relevant.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewers' comments to Author	Author's response
Reviewer: 1. Henry Lawson University of	We believe that given the nature of the
Ghana.	manuscript (the protocol of a future study), the
This manuscript is written in the format of a	use of future tense is appropriate. In term of
proposal. A lot of future tense is used. There are	sections, we followed the guidelines provided by
no results discussion, conclusion, or	the journal for this type of submission.
recommendations. No limitations were	We expanded the initial set of limitations to
discussed	include those arising from the choice of case
	study design (Pages 3 and 16).
Reviewer: 2. Dr. Manuela Villar-Uribe World	We agree with the recommendation to include a
Bank Group	larger sample Malawi than in the other two
	countries. This decision was indeed made by
The proposed sampling strategy and sample	our team; final sample sizes per country will be
size across countries is likely to be sufficient but	reported in the corresponding case study
the authors should be aware of the multiple	manuscript.
efforts and stakeholders involved in PHC	Further, due to the focus of our research
measurement in Malawi and account for a	questions and aims, and to operational
potential larger sample size. I suggest that the	limitations (i.e., conducting research during the
authors more explicitly mention how interviews	Covid pandemic and corresponding time
will include respondents that represent different	constraints among respondents), this research
actors in the data generation processing	is solely focused on the <i>utilization</i> of
analysis and decision-making process; it will be	performance information by end-users such
important to elucidate the role of data use by	as MOH decision makers and PHC providers. A
those that generate the data those that compile	focus on data producers or data availability,
it and those that receive it in an aggregated	while important, is outside the scope of our
manner for policy making.	research.
The authors should also consider and plan in	We appreciate the need to provide a frame of
their data collection strategy for a methodology	reference and have thus included references to
to define primary health care in each country as	the definitions used by WHO
well as performance and its measures to ensure	(Page 4). However, given that the phenomena
a comparability across respondents. The	of interest in this study are the performance
definition of PHC is very often not uniform	management practices used in each country
across countries or within countries hence a	and the extent to which respondents report
common definition at least among respondents	using performance information, we will not
in each country is likely to allow for comparisons	compare their understandings about what
	PHC is. In our opinion, the

and understanding of commonalities across	latter would constitute a separate research
respondents.	question. We will, however, inquire as to the
lespondents.	•
	respondents' knowledge of and opinions about
	each ministry's PHC priorities as these pertain
	to service delivery routines (by providers) and
	managerial practices (among MOH decision
	makers). Finally, aware of the current debate
	about decolonizing global health, we believe
	that we are in no position to advocate for, or
	'push,' towards universal definitions of PHC.
The mentioned routine health information	We agree that RHUS may not necessarily be
systems most often do not actually provide	optimal sources of PHC system performance.
strong measures of PHC performance as	However, they are widely used by
no denominators are available for contrasting	governments and oftentimes they are the sole
service delivery volumes with need; a clear	available source of information to
definition of PHC performance measures will	monitor PHC system performance. Other data
likely help consolidate findings across	sources such as population and/or facility
respondents.	surveys tend to be donor-driven and
	are less common than in OECD countries. While
	we intend to explore the use of performance
	information from all
	available sources, characterizing specific PHC
	performance measures in use in each country is
	outside of the scope of this research.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Villar-Uribe , Manuela World Bank Group
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Oct-2022

	-
GENERAL COMMENTS	The ideas presented in this protocol and results of the proposed study will be of great value to those working to support or improve PHC performance measurement in countries across the world. I appreciate the efforts that the authors have made to address my comments to the previous draft; (i) openness to increase the sample size in Malawi is welcome, (ii) further clarity on the intent to interview only public sector care providers and MOH staff is also helpful (although it provides a limited view of the PHC system, regardless of definition that the authors might choose to highlight), (iii) introduction of a WHO definition of PHC, to the text, and finally (iv) the clarification that RHIS information might be complemented with other information to provide a more complete picture of the PHC system's performance and understanding of patterns for its utilization.