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General
The authors sought to evaluate China’s “Community Hygiene Concern”, and to propose initiatives for making this approach to community health care delivery more efficient. Unfortunately, the article did not make interesting reading, and does not appear suitable for journal publication in its present format.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

- It was not clear from the article whether the authors were discussing “Community Hygiene Resources”, or “Community Hygiene Concern”, or “Community Health Services”. Community Hygiene Resources fall within the realm of community health education, and are usually focussed on evaluating methods for disease prevention, protection and cure, and disseminating information on best practice when evidence on effectiveness is found. Such health education activities were not described in depth in the article.
- For a concept described as “an important part of Chinese medical mechanism reform”, it was surprising that there are currently no scholarly articles on China’s ‘Community Hygiene Concern’ in biomedical or public health journals. The ‘main service items’ of Community Hygiene Concern, as described by the authors, touch on the core activities of the Chinese Public Health system. This leaves readers confused as to what issues the authors are actually addressing.
- The ‘methodology and indicators’ section bears little relevance to the article’s topic and introductory sections. For example, in evaluating the efficiency of community hygiene resources, staff income should not normally be accorded such high priority. In contrast, the authors did not report any evaluation of the quality of hygiene information provided by the sites surveyed, appropriateness of dissemination media utilized, and/or the receptivity of end-users to the information provided.
- The conclusions are rather discursive, and not well-linked to the findings from the survey. For example, it is unusual to suggest that; “community hygiene services must be adapted to the requirement of city medical and hygiene reform”. In fact, the rational sequence is for the reforms to be adapted to mutually identified community health needs. Also, the conclusions appear to over-emphasize a medical model for delivery of community health services.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Professional proof-reading, in order to correct lexical and structural errors, and thus make the article more reader-friendly.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes
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There were not enough details in the manuscript to evaluate the accuracy of the authors' statistical analyses.