# Peer Review Report

# Review Report on The mediating role of digital competence in the associations between the factors affecting healthcare utilization and access to care

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Antonio Palacios-Rodríguez

## EVALUATION

### Q 1  Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The article is coherent, although it needs revision of its writing. The topic is very interesting and covers a relevant topic. At first glance, it seems to offer a significant perspective on the study of medical education, with a great contribution to the educational community. However, it has a research design that can be considerably improved to meet the scientific rigor required by the journal.

### Q 2  Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

It is recommended:

Check spelling and grammar.

Respect IMRyD structure in the summary. Discussion of data is missing.

Restructure the introduction. The theoretical foundations studied must be deepened. It is recommended to rework the introduction and write new sections that highlight what has been researched to date on the topic. These findings should serve to justify the conclusions of the study and discussion of results.

Review citation and referencing in depth.

Justify the use of statistics and clarify the type of study in the summary.

Expand validation and reliability data.

Try to link the initial reflections (theoretical review) with the discussion and conclusions.

Add study limitations. In the same way, possible future lines of research should be added.

### 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.

It is recommended:

Check spelling and grammar.

Respect IMRyD structure in the summary. Discussion of data is missing.

Restructure the introduction. The theoretical foundations studied must be deepened. It is recommended to rework the introduction and write new sections that highlight what has been researched to date on the topic. These findings should serve to justify the conclusions of the study and discussion of results.

Review citation and referencing in depth.

Justify the use of statistics and clarify the type of study in the summary.

Expand validation and reliability data.

Try to link the initial reflections (theoretical review) with the discussion and conclusions.

Add study limitations. In the same way, possible future lines of research should be added.

## PLEASE COMMENT

### Q 4  Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

–

| Q 5 | Are the keywords appropriate? |

–

| Q 6 | Is the English language of sufficient quality? |

–

| 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?) |

–

## 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.