

Letter to the Editor

Clarity on the Type of Review. Comment on “Value Cocreation in Health Care: Systematic Review”

Fnu Kajal, MD, MSc

University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, United States

Corresponding Author:

Fnu Kajal, MD, MSc

University of Arizona

Global Center

615 North Park Avenue

Tucson, AZ, 85721

United States

Phone: 1 7233866266

Email: kkajal@email.arizona.edu

Related Articles:

Comment on: <http://www.jmir.org/2022/3/e33061/>

Comment in: <http://www.jmir.org/2022/7/e39397/>

(*J Med Internet Res* 2022;24(7):e38457) doi: [10.2196/38457](https://doi.org/10.2196/38457)

KEYWORDS

value cocreation; health care; patient value; health care professional value; systematic review

I have read the systematic review titled, “Value Cocreation in Health Care: Systematic Review,” by Peng et al [1]. The objective of the paper was to identify and review the literature as the area of value cocreation is new to health care. The topic is very relevant as there is a need to add value to health care that will ultimately help to reduce health inequities.

While this review summarizes the literature well, it does not qualify as a systematic review. Foremost is the lack of a clear question the review seeks to answer. A systematic review is usually conducted to answer a question; in this case, the authors seem to have conducted a scoping or narrative review systematically.

The authors themselves state that this area of research is new and the literature is fragmented. Thus, it would have been better to have conducted a scoping review rather than a systematic review [2]. Further, the search terms for this review do not seem to be adequate to capture all research on the subject. For example, the phrases used in the search strategy do not include “respectful care,” which is often used in value cocreation in health care systems.

In addition, a high-quality systematic review follows PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines and checklists. This must be addressed in reference to PICO (population, intervention, comparators, and outcome). The systematic review lacks clarity on comparators and does not provide a list of all outcomes for which data were sought [3]. The MMAT (Mixed Method Appraisal Tool) does mention the quality of studies but lacks the anticipated risk of bias assessment in individual studies. Further, the authors have also not detailed any variability between the studies through heterogeneity, which might have impacted the interpretation of the results [4].

Most problematic, however, is the framework developed and presented in this review. The methodology of mapping the findings onto an existing theory is not a standard method. The authors need to justify why this method was adopted. The utility of this framework, therefore, is also not clear.

This area of research is clearly very relevant, and the authors have tried to put together the literature on this, but their systematic review needs more details at the granular level for a better understanding of the gaps and solutions to address areas of concern in the future.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

References

1. Peng Y, Wu T, Chen Z, Deng Z. Value cocreation in health care: Systematic review. *J Med Internet Res* 2022 Mar 25;24(3):e33061 [[FREE Full text](#)] [doi: [10.2196/33061](https://doi.org/10.2196/33061)] [Medline: [35333183](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35333183/)]
2. Peters M, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, McInerney P, Parker D, Soares CB. Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *Int J Evid Based Healthc* 2015 Sep;13(3):141-146. [doi: [10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050](https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050)] [Medline: [26134548](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26134548/)]
3. Page M, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021 Mar 29;372:n71 [[FREE Full text](#)] [doi: [10.1136/bmj.n71](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71)] [Medline: [33782057](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33782057/)]
4. Higgins J, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002 Jun 15;21(11):1539-1558. [doi: [10.1002/sim.1186](https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186)] [Medline: [12111919](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12111919/)]

Abbreviations

MMAT: Mixed Method Appraisal Tool

PICO: population, intervention, comparators, and outcome

PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

Edited by T Leung; this is a non-peer-reviewed article. Submitted 13.04.22; accepted 24.05.22; published 11.07.22.

Please cite as:

Kajal F

Clarity on the Type of Review. Comment on "Value Cocreation in Health Care: Systematic Review"

J Med Internet Res 2022;24(7):e38457

URL: <https://www.jmir.org/2022/7/e38457>

doi: [10.2196/38457](https://doi.org/10.2196/38457)

PMID: [35816377](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35816377/)

©Fnu Kajal. Originally published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research (<https://www.jmir.org>), 11.07.2022. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work, first published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research, is properly cited. The complete bibliographic information, a link to the original publication on <https://www.jmir.org/>, as well as this copyright and license information must be included.