

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Comparison of health care utilization in different usual sources of care among older people with cardiovascular disease in China: evidence from the Study on Global Ageing and Adult Health

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Parul Puri

Submitted on: 28 May 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606103

### EVALUATION

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

The findings suggest that the patients using primary care facilities as USC had lower hospital admissions while their unmet health needs were more than patients identifying public hospitals as USC. Compared with patients who used private clinics as their USC, individuals who identified public clinics as their USC had more outpatient visits

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

The SAGE-China data did not cover all types of CVDs, which is a data limitation. Also, use of cross-sectional dataset does not allow to study causality.

It is a novel attempt to study the effect of USC on Healthcare utilization.

#### **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.

1. I am not convinced by the use of word "impact" in the manuscript. As we are dealing with one round of a cross-sectional study, it would be better using any alternative like "effect".
2. Please do not use abbreviation in the abstract.
3. Also, please mention the full form of the abbreviation wherever it is used for the first time.
4. Discussion section needs to be more crisp. Authors can also try to re-organize these.
5. Not sure what hospital rank means, please elaborate in the limitation section.
6. What are the implications of the findings
7. Recheck the manuscript for grammatical and spelling errors.

### PLEASE COMMENT

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

I am not convinced by the use of word "impact" in the manuscript. As we are dealing with one round of a cross-sectional study, it would be better using any alternative like "effect".

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

yes.

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

Yes, but can be improved with proof-reading.

**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.