

Peer Review

Review of: "Health Literacy, Health Information-Seeking, and Preventive Health Practices among College and University Students in Hanoi, Vietnam: A Multicenter Cross-Sectional Study"

Emily Carter¹

1. Independent researcher

The ethics reporting needs a clearer, dedicated statement in the Methods. The discussion says that no formal ethics approval was obtained and refers readers to a disclosure that I could not locate. Please explain why approval was not sought and whether any institution reviewed the study or determined that it was exempt. If no such determination was made, that should be stated plainly. It would also help to describe what participants were told before completing the survey, how consent was recorded, whether identifying information was collected, and who could access the data. Because recruitment involved student affairs offices and class groups, please clarify how voluntary participation was communicated and whether students were assured that declining would have no academic consequences.

The discussion already acknowledges that the fruit consumption association is modest, but its implications could be developed further. A 10-point higher health literacy score corresponded to 0.16 additional consumption days per week, with a confidence interval of 0.03–0.29 days. Readers would benefit from an explanation of what this difference can tell us about students' diets, especially since portion sizes and total intake were not measured. The larger differences between information-seeking groups are interesting, although health motivation, food affordability, and living arrangements remain possible explanations. Campus initiatives are therefore reasonable candidates for future evaluation, but the present findings do not establish that encouraging more searching will improve dietary habits.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.