

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Manuscript: The impact of air pollution controls on health and health inequity among middle-aged and older Chinese: evidence from panel data

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Patrick Goodman

Submitted on: 04 Mar 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606956

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The paper adds to our knowledge that when air pollution controls are put in place, which work at reducing air pollution that there are associated health benefits.

These benefits are more pronounced in the lower socio-economic groups.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strength, shows that those most affected receive the greater benefits of interventions

Weakness: considering the population of China, the sample size is relatively small

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.

Minor

In the abstract I suggest you maybe say over 65, >65 age group etc. More detail on the population group that are included.

The term "air Governance" is not that widely used, suggest considering an alternative such as "Air Quality controls"

Line 52, there have been some significant publication on the success of interventions (planned or otherwise), ones that come to mind are the London congestion charging/control zones/Low emission zones, and the Utah Valley strike. So I suggest these references should be updated.

Line 76, I'm not convinced this is true, tobacco smoke is mostly

Major

Its not clear that the researchers are taking account of the fact that PM10 actually includes PM2.5. It is also not clear if the modelling of the data has taken this into account

Also based on the title, I would have expected a significantly larger population.

Minor

line 178 very confusing suggest it be re-written

Better captions are needed for the figures.

I found the table a little confusing and difficult to follow, could they be improved upon

More detail on the actual interventions/governance/PM levels would be useful, key PM sources in each location etc

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Perhaps change the word "governance"

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Needs some work

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?)

No I think this could be improved upon

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.