

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Food insecurity, health care utilization, and health care expenditures: A longitudinal cohort study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Alvaro Javier Idrovo

Submitted on: 17 Jan 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605360

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The manuscript is about the association between food security and health service utilization/health expenditure in Korean cohorts (2008–2021). The authors reported that more food insecurity was associated with more utilization of health services and less health expenditure.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

It is a follow-up study with national data with secondary data.

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.

I propose some modifications/comments to improve the manuscript:

Major comments

1. Not all IJPH readers know how the Korean health system works. It is suggested that a brief explanation of how the system works be included, emphasizing aspects related to the use of services and health spending (especially out-of-pocket spending).
2. The results show the findings related to the baseline and the association between food security and utilization of health services/health expenditure. In order to better understand the findings, it is suggested to report on the association estimators of the independent variables such as multimorbidity.
3. Study participants are over 19 years of age. Is there a selection bias? (since only those who have survived to this age or meet inclusion criteria, as people without disabilities are included)
4. Although the findings refer to a follow-up study, which gives great validity to the results, from the baseline data there are important differences between cohorts. This suggests that the effects come from ages less than 19 years, so this should be discussed extensively in the manuscript.

Minor comment

5. Is it possible that out-of-pocket spending on health be expressed as a percentage of income? It would be interesting to see these analyzes to have more clarity on the findings.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, it is OK.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

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, the references included 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.