

Peer Review Report

Review Report on The association between living area in childhood and respiratory disease mortality in adulthood

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Hailay Gesesew

Submitted on: 08 Feb 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604778

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study found that living in large city areas was reported to have a significant relationship with risk of all-cause mortality, particularly among men.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

It's a study conducted using large cohort and applied advanced inferential statistics. However, there are some clarity issues as described in detail below.

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.

Line 22: objective...not objectives

Line 24: add 'in adulthood' at the end.

Line 31: add 'in childhood' after "...areas"

Line 31-33: I think it should be revised as it distracts the reader. I would do "....Living in large city areas in childhood was associated with a higher risk of all-cause mortality (HR=1.05 (95% CI, 1.01-1.10)), but not with respiratory disease mortality (HR=1.05 (95% CI, 0.93-1.18)) compared to rural and remote areas.

Line 38: "...risk of mortality from"

Line 84: Could the authors add why Japan was chosen as a case study? And why is respiratory illness chosen as opposed to other illness? Clinical, social and environmental related justifications may be need.

Line 89: could the authors add the significance of this study i.e. to population health, life expectancy and so on.

Line 108: Could the authors add the Reference number of the ethics approval from both stated universities?

Line 111: Add the operational definition of Childhood.

Line 125: The covariates need to be clear whether they are to the childhood or adulthood status. This should also be clear to the variables mentioned under the "Statistical analysis" section under line 145.

Line 145: could the authors add more details, say: if Kaplan Meir Curve was used to estimate survival time and compare time to event among different groups; and if log rank test was applied if survival time was estimated. (If not, why?)

Line 165: I think the authors need to provide a general description of the cohort and they can cite Table 1 for more details. For example, the overall mean age, overall percentage of men and women, overall percentage of hypertension, diabetes, and some risk factors such as smoking.

Line 174: better to add a separate statement describing what Table 2 is about. Say"Table 2 shows the HRs of all cause mortality according to the type of childhood living area"

Line 208: Discussion is needed why the type of childhood living area is linked with all cause mortality but not respiratory. Moreover, why the gender difference too?

Line 260: Could the authors give an overall implications of their findings to future studies, policy makers, and even to the population wellbeing of Japan and beyond?

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title needs clarity— it's not easy to identify the factor and outcome.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes but 'mortality' could be added at least.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes but in some of the statements, they need another read by a language editor— I have indicated in my detailed comments.

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



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.