

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Inequities in household out-of-pocket spending among urban slum dwellers in Southeast Nigeria

Original Article, Int. J. Public Health

Reviewer: Monica Ewomazino Akokuwebe, PhD

Submitted on: 07 Oct 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2025.1607969

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

See my comments in the attached Peer Review Comments.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

See my comments in the attached Peer Review Comments.

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.

See my comments in the attached Peer Review Comments.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

See my comments in the attached Peer Review Comments.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes, the keywords are appropriate.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Editing of the English content of the Manuscript

You should use one of them in British or American English. Ask for a Professional English editor to address all grammatical errors and lexis structure of your manuscript.

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?)

The authors will check the references for this study and should put them in journal format. Kindly check and revisit them all.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9	Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10	Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11	Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 12	Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13	Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 14	Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.