

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Precision Epidemiology: A Computational Analysis of the Impact of Algorithmic Prediction on the Relationship between Population Epidemiology and Clinical Epidemiology

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Siquan Wang

Submitted on: 24 May 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607396

### EVALUATION

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

The manuscript suggests that a renewed separation between clinical and population epidemiology is emerging, with clinical epidemiology taking more advantage of recent algorithmic techniques and moving closer to bioinformatics. In contrast, population epidemiology seems to be slower in this innovation.

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

The strengths include the comprehensive study period and data, while the limitations are in the scope of the study.

#### 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.

The manuscript is in good shape, and the following comments need to be addressed before accepted for publication

1. Please discuss why using MeSH terms could help distinguish research communities that publish their work in different journals
2. Please elaborate more on the structural topic modeling methods used in the study
3. Please include the package and software version used in the study

### PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes

#### 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

**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.