

Peer Review

Review of: "Assessing the Relationship Between Clean Cooking Fuels and Women's Cancer Mortality in the European Union: An Empirical Analysis"

Wei Hu¹

1. Yangtze University, China

Grammar and Language Expression

- **Tense Consistency:** The use of tense throughout the paper is generally appropriate, but in some areas, the choice of tense could be further examined. For instance, "The findings underscore the potential of clean energy initiatives" is correctly in the present tense. However, when discussing past studies, ensure the use of the past tense, such as in "Research by Smith and Pillarisetti[15] supports this assertion," which is suitable. Overall, maintaining a consistent tense is key.
- **Verb Usage:** For example, the phrase "the hidden cost of this energy source lies in" could be revised to "the hidden cost of this energy source lies in its impact on health," making the sentence clearer.
- **Coherence and Transition:** There is a lack of clear transitions between some sentences and paragraphs. For instance, in the paragraph starting with "Moreover, a shift towards clean cooking...", a transitional sentence like "Building on the health benefits mentioned earlier..." could improve the flow from the previous ideas, making the paragraph's argument more cohesive.

2. Logical Structure and Content Coherence

- **Clarity of Research Question and Objective:** The introduction clearly presents the research question and objectives. However, the transition from "clean cooking fuels" to "health outcomes" could be better linked. It would be helpful to briefly clarify why this variable was chosen as the central focus of the study, making the research goal more explicitly tied to the issue at hand.

- **Hypotheses:** The hypotheses (H1 and H2) are clearly formulated but could be elaborated further, especially in terms of contextualizing them with existing literature. For example, in H1 and H2, when introducing the supporting evidence, it would be beneficial to compare them with other studies to strengthen their validity and rationale.

3. Detailing and Hierarchical Information

- **Methodology Details:** While the paper mentions using "OLS" and "QREG" regression models, it doesn't provide sufficient explanation of why these specific models were chosen or their advantages. Expanding on how these models are particularly suited for analyzing time-series data and their advantages in this context would be helpful. A brief explanation of how these models handle specific types of data (e.g., time-series, non-normal distributions) would clarify their choice.
- **Results and Discussion Expansion:** Although conclusions like “clean energy initiatives can reduce cancer mortality” are mentioned, the paper could further discuss the practical implications of these findings. Adding more empirical support (e.g., specific data) and focusing on the applicability of these conclusions in policy design would improve the section's robustness.

4. Data and Evidence Support

- **Literature Support:** The paper references studies like “Smith et al.” but could benefit from incorporating more specific data or findings from these references to make the connection clearer. For example, citing specific figures or trends from studies would strengthen the argument. Consider providing more context for studies such as “Chen et al.” and “Chafe et al.” to enhance the paper's credibility.
- **Data Details:** When discussing methods like "OLS" and "QREG" regression, it would be helpful to mention data sources, sample sizes, and any potential limitations in the data to give readers a clearer picture of the study's foundation.

5. Structure and Paragraph Transition

- **Paragraph Transitions:** Some transitions between paragraphs are a bit abrupt, especially when moving from “air pollution” to “women’s health.” It would be beneficial to add transition phrases

such as “Building on the public health risks posed by household air pollution...” to ensure smoother transitions.

- **Contextualizing Social Factors:** The section on “gender inequality” could benefit from a more structured theoretical background on the link between women’s health, education, and environmental factors. Integrating some theories or models explaining these relationships would make the argument stronger and more scientifically grounded.

6. Conclusion Clarity

- **Policy Recommendations:** The conclusion presents "gender-responsive healthcare policies," but these could be further developed. For instance, what specific policy measures could improve women’s access to cancer prevention and treatment? Are there any educational or public health measures that can directly address this issue?
- **Limitations and Future Research:** The paper mentions limitations but could expand on how these limitations might be addressed in future studies. For example, it would be helpful to discuss how future research could use improved data collection methods, longitudinal studies, or better control for confounding factors to enhance the study's findings.

7. Details Optimization and Language Refinement

- **Long Sentences:** Some sentences are quite long and may hinder readability. For instance, “Household air pollution (HAP) predominantly results from the inefficient combustion of solid fuels like wood, coal, and biomass, primarily for cooking and heating purposes” could be simplified to “Household air pollution (HAP) mainly results from inefficient combustion of solid fuels such as wood, coal, and biomass used for cooking and heating.”
- **Word Choice:** There are instances where words could be more precise. For example, "hidden cost of this energy source" could be revised to “health-related costs of using these energy sources” to make the impact clearer.

8. References

- **Reference Consistency:** Ensure that all references are consistently formatted, both in-text and in the reference list. Verify that every citation corresponds to a full reference and follows the journal’s required citation style.

Conclusion:

Overall, the paper is well-structured and presents a clear research question and objectives. However, improvements in the flow of ideas, further elaboration of hypotheses, and more detailed explanations of methodologies would enhance the clarity and depth of the paper. Including more specific empirical data and stronger connections to existing literature would increase the paper's credibility and strengthen the argument. Lastly, refining the conclusion and expanding on policy recommendations, limitations, and future research directions will help create a more comprehensive and impactful paper.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.