

Peer Review Report

Review Report on A Geodemographic View of the Accessibility of Selected Outpatient Services in Czechia

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Arkalgud Ramaprasad

Submitted on: 22 Oct 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604067

EVALUATION

Q 1 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.

The article has tremendous potential and is on an important topic. The author has access to an excellent data set. However, the framing of the research question is very discursive. Please revise the tables and the figures and walk the reviewers through them systematically. Please provide a framework of your logic that will help the reviewer.

Q 2 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The accessibility and utilization of healthcare is a function of the location of the patient, the provider, ability and willingness to travel, and the differences in the patient's places of residence.

Q 3 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strength -- Rich data set.

Limitations -- Unclear presentation of results and discussion of the same.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Can be modified.

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?

No.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 ▶ Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 ▶ Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.