

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Differences in awareness of Chinese dietary guidelines among urban and rural residents: Cross-sectional survey in Southwest China

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Neşe Yakşı

Submitted on: 21 Oct 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605344

### EVALUATION

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

Knowledge levels of CDGs in urban and rural areas differ significantly. Moreover, the knowledge level of CDGs in urban areas varies considerably according to sociodemographic factors rather than in rural areas.

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

There are few studies from the region of China about the knowledge level of CDGs. This is a strength of this research. Also, if a probabilistic sampling technique was used, the sample size is large enough, but it should be addressed with sample size calculation.

#### **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.

Dear Editor,

I reviewed the paper. There are no significant deficiencies in planning, applying, and analyzing the study. However, I noticed that some of the methodological definitions were missing. I think this study which may have a high scientific value can be re-evaluated and published after the revisions I have mentioned below.  
Best Regards

#### Major comments

- 1) Minimum sample size acquirement, sample size calculation, study participation rate, and sample selection method should be explained in detail in the study design and sample section.
- 2) Was the score obtained from the questions in the 2nd part of the questionnaire and the classification made accordingly (under 6 points and above 6 points) used for the level of knowledge or for awareness? If the total score represents knowledge level, why is there no statistical analysis regarding this score? Are the words of 'knowledge' and 'awareness' used interchangeably with the same meaning? If not, how was 'awareness' measured? This should be explained in detail in the method section. If the definitions of awareness and knowledge exist in CDGs separately, they should be referred to and stated in the method section. Accordingly, choosing one of these two words is appropriate if they are used with the same meaning. However, based on the questions in the second part of the questionnaire, I think it would be more convenient to use knowledge instead of awareness in all parts of the manuscript, including the title and keywords.
- 3) English writing of the manuscript should be rechecked.

#### Minor comments

- 1) In the abstract section, BMI should be written as Body Mass Index
- 2) 'urban-rural gap' should be used instead of 'urbanrural gap'
- 3) Line 28: FBDGs should be written instead of FBGD

- 4) Line 65: Due to this is not an interventional study, I think writing 'demonstrate' or indicate can be more convenient instead of 'improve'
- 5) Line 148: Age should be presented with mean and standard deviation.
- 6) Line 153–155: One sentence is enough for economic status comparison.
- 7) Line 151: 'The same trend was also reflected in education, and only 36.8% of rural participants had high education.' This is an unclear sentence. The same trend statement is not suitable in this sentence.
- 8) Line 156: What does awareness mean?
- 9) Line 163: Instead of 'item scoring rates', 'correct answer rates' should be used.
- 10) Line 164: Instead of 'urban participants were more correct than rural participants' 'urban participants had higher correct answer rates' should be used.
- 11) p values should be standardized in the text and tables, with three digits after the dot as absolute numbers (e.g.  $p=0.720$ ) or as  $p>0.05$  for all nonsignificant results.
- 12) Line 168: Instead of 'rural 168 participants were more correct than urban participants', 'rural participants had higher correct answer rates'
- 13) Line 175: a comma should be added after (OR: 0.74; CI: 0.57–0.97) for true meaning.
- 14) Line 173–180: Reference groups should be specified in this paragraph. In addition, while some variables making a significant difference for subgroups were mentioned, some were not. This situation has disturbed the integrity and caused misuse (e.g.: However, only intellectuals (OR: 1.35; CI: 1.09–1.68) in rural regions were aware)
- 15) 'However, rural participants were likely to acquire relevant knowledge from food sales staff' This sentence can not be indicated before ( $p<0.05$ ) due to the p-value of this comparison was shown as  $p<0.10$  in Figure 1.  $p<0.10$  does not represent significant difference according to your statements in the method section.
- 16) The method section should add which tests are used in the simple analyses of continuous variables.

#### PLEASE COMMENT

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

Was the score obtained from the questions in the 2nd part of the questionnaire and the classification made accordingly (under 6 points and above 6 points) used for the level of knowledge or for awareness? If the total score represents knowledge level, why there is no statistical analysis regarding this score? Are the words of 'knowledge' and 'awareness' used interchangeably with the same meaning? If not, how was 'awareness' measured? This should be explained in detail in the method section. If the definitions of awareness and knowledge exist in CDGs separately, they should be referred and stated in the method section. Accordingly, choosing one of these two words is appropriate if they are used with the same meaning. However, based on the content of the questions in the second part of the questionnaire, I think it would be more convenient to use knowledge instead of awareness in all parts of the manuscript, also in the title.

##### **Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

1. Was the score obtained from the questions in the 2nd part of the questionnaire and the classification made accordingly (under 6 points and above 6 points) used for the level of knowledge or for awareness? If the total score represents knowledge level, why there is no statistical analysis regarding this score? Are the words of 'knowledge' and 'awareness' used interchangeably with the same meaning? If not, how was 'awareness' measured? This should be explained in detail in the method section. If the definitions of awareness and knowledge exist in CDGs separately, they should be referred and stated in the method section. Accordingly, choosing one of these two words is appropriate if they are used with the same meaning. However, based on the content of the questions in the second part of the questionnaire, I think it would be more convenient to use knowledge instead of awareness in all parts of the manuscript, also in keywords.
2. I think urbanrural gap is not suitable as a keyword; it is not mentioned anywhere in the main text as urbanrural gap. Instead, if there is no restriction on the number of keywords, urban and rural can be used as separate keywords.

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

English level of manuscript is moderate in my opinion, it should be checked for final version of manuscript.

**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.