

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Identification and economic evaluation of differentiated thyroid cancer care consumption patterns using sequence analysis

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Christos MELIDIS

Submitted on: 14 Dec 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606664

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This study shows that the total costs of patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma in Southwest France, all included and for the first three years, sum up to 11.600€.

Authors show that the cost is higher for patients with high risk of recurrence, for women and coming from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

STRENGTHS: authors use real life data from reliable sources and this may indeed be the first article for France taking all costs into account.

LIMITATIONS: very few results are statistically significant (or new or having something to add to scientific knowledge), yet authors present them as such.

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.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to review this article, please see attached Word file.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

No, authors do not clearly identify the pathways. Additionally, I'm not sure why the word "several" is there, authors either cover all possible pathways or not.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Relatively speaking yes. The article has other major issues and the few english corrections that are needed (see detailed review) are rather minor.

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?)

I have to admit that I'm not sure if the journal has an upper limit, but in this article's case I'd rather see MORE references. But the ones that exist are adequate.

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:

Major revisions.