

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Food choices and hypertension among rural Thais–Evidence from a Discrete Choice Experiment

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Derya Dikmen

Submitted on: 05 Apr 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604850

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The researchers aimed to evaluate the food choice attributes that influence the choices of hypertensive and normotensive who lived in rural Thailand. The mean age of the participants was 60 years and 73% of them were women. The participants 53.85% were hypertensive. The most important food attribute was salt content. The others were food preparation, price and taste, respectively.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The researchers explain the limitation and the strengths of their study.
There are some to include; The discrete choice experimental design was the strength of this study to explain the food choice attribute of the participants.
Limitation of the study for me in the DCE model they chose the nutritional value attribute as salt. Because of the half of the participants were hypertensive this chose could effect the results. And salt is a confounding factor for taste and the nutritional value.

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.

Article is interesting to read. The sample size method and statistical methods were correctly applied. However there are some points need to be detailed and clarified:
study group selected randomly in northern rural Thailand however the half of the group was hypertensive and the others were normotensive, could you please explain how did the half of the participants randomly hypertensive?
Could you please explain more detailed how did you choose salt as a nutritional attribute for the food choice? The mean age was the participants 60 years, that may be effect the results of the study, could you please discussed in the discussion part? Did the participants have any other disease? Did they live alone or are they living with their families?
IN discussion part the researchers comment on their results but in terms of food choice determinants they have to comment more detailed to their findings, for example, Food preparation was considered the second most important attribute in both normotensive and hypertensive groups. the authors discussed that the people lived in rural areas have time to cook, this comment seems limited in terms of food choice determinants. This finding should be discussed more with economical reasons, gender and the age of your participants??
Salt is one of the major tastes and the item taste was the least important factor in your study, could you please explain more this fact can be a confounder for your research?
The findings of the study should discussed more detailed in a comprehensive perspective.
Conclusion was only about salt reduction program but you aimed to determine the food choice attributes of the participants what is your conclusion according to your results??

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Title is appropriate and concise. The method they used (DCE) make the title and manuscript attractive.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Keywords are appropriate however, they did not measure salt intake, they measure the choice so the salt intake keyword is not appropriate.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

The article language is understandable and easy to follow.

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.