

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Geoprivacy in neighbourhoods and health research: a mini-review of the challenges and best practices in epidemiological studies

Mini Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Miroslaw Mazurek

Submitted on: 05 Jul 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2022.1605105

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

Geoprivacy in broad access to the Internet and IoT is a very important element of today's world. Data theft, especially of medical data, is an important element of data security and patient privacy. On the basis of data, we can determine many important characteristics of patients and easily locate such a person in a real environment. The topic of the article is up-to-date and shows what challenges and threats await data managers and users.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The limitation of the presented article is that the content is quite general, but the idea and research results are very promising and important for users of data processing systems. There is a lack of information and quantitative analysis of attacks, the level of threat, ways to minimize threats, etc.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

The text is very interesting and timely. The theoretical approach was presented in a comprehensive way, but the presented research results are general. There is no description of the input data sets, no specific analysis on the basis of which conclusions can be drawn. This area needs to be improved. The paper does not carry signs of plagiarism.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes. The authors clearly and attractive defined the title of the study, but the presented results are general. The work is about challenges and the best practices in epidemiological research - the formulation of the topic is fully correct and attractive for the reader.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

In my opinion the keywords are appropriate. I suggest add: Data Protection, anonymization.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes. The paper is written in clear and understandable language.

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Not Applicable.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

The publication cited list is relevant and and unbiased, fully covers the issues described.

Q 9 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 10 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 11 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 12 Does the review have international or global implications?

The review have global implications.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Quality of generalization and summary



Q 14 Significance to the field



Q 15 Interest to a general audience



Q 16 Quality of the writing



REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.