

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Evolution of Esophageal Cancer Incidence Patterns in Hong Kong: A Three-Decade Analysis with Future Projections

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Claudia Agnoli

Submitted on: 07 Jun 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607315

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

In this study, the authors evaluated historical trends in crude and age-standardized incidence rates of esophageal cancer in Hong Kong, together with future projections, separately for men and women. The analysis of historical trends evaluated age, period, and cohort effects. The results show a significant decline in the incidence of esophageal cancer over the past three decades, mainly due to a period and a cohort effect. Thus, it appears that the effects of public health preventive strategies have offset the increasing incidence due to population aging. Results on projections show a further decrease in incidence.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Main limitations: lack of information on esophageal cancer subtypes and on prevalence of risk factors (smoking, overweight/obesity, dietary habits, alcohol consumption, esophageal reflux); use of age structure from UN World Population Prospects instead of Hong Kong.

Main strengths: use of a data from a high quality cancer registry.

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.

Overall, the manuscript is well written and results are clearly described. Thus, I have only the following minor comments:

- Methods, page 7, lines 101–102: this sentence is a repetition of the previous one and should be deleted;
- Results, page 8, lines 137–138: this sentence is a repetition of the previous one and should be deleted;
- Results, page 9, line 152: apparently, there is a different local drift for men and women in the age group <40 years, do the authors have some explanations?
- Discussion, page 14, lines 258–263: although the authors do not have information on esophageal cancer risk factors, they should cite and discuss with greater detail published data on lifestyle.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, it is.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes, they are.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, it is.

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, it does. My only suggestion is to cite and discuss with greater detail published data on lifestyle factors improvement in Hong Kong (see answer to Q3).

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.