

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Does social pension expansion relieve depression and decrease medical costs? Evidence from the rural elderly in China

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Yuxi Luo

Submitted on: 20 Nov 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604296

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This paper analyzes the NRPS policy impact on depression and induced medical cost in regard of China's rural elderly. According to the CFPS (2012,2016), authors utilize Grossman's framework to identify the three pathways that policy impacts the mental health. Authors use the logit, OLS, 2SLS model to reveal the impact, and adopt the quantile regression and RDD to do a robustness check. The main findings are: (1) NRPS decrease the depressive symptoms of elderly by 5.2% in rural China, decrease the induced medical cost by 4.5%. After the robustness check, results show that NRPS may improve the life quality of elderly in rural China through lowering down their mental health problems and induced medical cost.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The major limitations of this paper may be the dataset that authors used. According to CFPS, we know that it contains 2010,2011,2012,2014,2016,2018 dataset, 2010 is the baseline, 2011 is the sample maintenance survey, 2012–2018 are longitudinal survey. Authors only utilize the survey data of 2012 and 2016 may cause potential bias. Besides that in regard of the theoretical foundation, a more sound theory framework is needed. For the empirical analysis part, authors use adequate statistical methods, and conduct the robustness check, which approve that empirical results are stabilized.

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.

Main concerns:

(1) data issue.

A more detailed explanation regarding to the data is needed.

May be a more complete dataset is desired.

Need to check the empirical result after adding more data.

(2) theory framework

A more sound theoretical foundation is necessary. For now, we can clarify the issue and what we try to do, but not the internal logic. Authors may need to find economic, sociological, and psychological theory or theories to support this study. We would like to see a clear theory development path of this paper.

(3) research gap and contribution

What's the main gap? What's the main contribution of this paper? Please provide a more detailed information.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is ok.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

keywords are fine.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

sufficeicent.

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?)

adding more relevant literature to improve the theoretical framework.

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.