



Nuzulul Putri <nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id>

BMC Public Health - Receipt of Manuscript 'National Health Insurance...'

1 pesan

BMC Public Health <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>
Kepada: nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id

20 Oktober 2022 pukul 09.41

Ref: Submission ID d0d4adc7-de17-4172-92aa-0d85d9f7ebf6

Dear Dr Putri,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to BMC Public Health.

Your manuscript is now at our initial Quality Check stage, where we look for adherence to the journal's submission guidelines, including any relevant editorial and publishing policies. If there are any points that need to be addressed prior to progressing we will send you a detailed email. Otherwise, your manuscript will proceed into peer review.

You can check on the status of your submission at any time by using the link below and logging in with the account you created for this submission:

https://researcher.nature.com/your-submissions?utm_source=submissions&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=confirmation-email&journal_id=12889

To help with your article processing charge at acceptance, and to see if you're eligible for any waivers or BMC membership discounts, please click here:

<https://payment.springernature.com/quote/identify/submission/d0d4adc7-de17-4172-92aa-0d85d9f7ebf6>

Kind regards,

Peer Review Advisors
BMC Public Health

Springer Nature offers an open access support service to make it easier for our authors to discover and apply for APC funding. For further information please visit <http://www.springernature.com/gp/open-research/funding>

Reviewer 1

Page & Line	Reviewers' comments	Authors' revisions
Abstract	I explored other publications on a similar topic, which happened to be authored by the second author of this article, and I found almost similar lines as used in the background and other parts of the abstract. The article's title is appropriate. The abbreviation "NHI" was used without mentioning what it stands for in the abstract.	We rewrote the abstract to ensure that it will be minimal in a similar writing style to the previous studies written by our authors.
Introduction	Although I found this section to be a little wordy, I enjoyed reading the facts, which included the history of NHI in Indonesia. I'd like to make it more chronological and logical, such as that mentioned in page 3, lines 1–4, about the fixed insurance premium following presidential regulation issuance. I was curious about how insurance premiums were paid in past years since it says on another line (page 3, line 15) that the NHI was first put into place in 2014. Were the facts presented in lines 5 and 17 of page 3 similarly telling about more than 80% of citizens being covered by the NHI? Please revise lines 17–21, as the facts presented in these lines are confusing. There is no clear introductory explanation about what SSAA is or its role in the NHI. Whether these two are different entities.	<p>We rewrote the background in a more chronological and logical order.</p> <p>We explained how health financing before NHI, how NHI works, mentioned factors related to its participation, and then finally explained the role of education factor.</p> <p>SSAA is the national agency that manages the NHI. Commonly, the participants of NHI are also called SSAA participants. We revise the background by consistently using NHI participants.</p>
Material and methods	Is the poll mentioned in lines 18–19 and its results publicly available to access and to confirm their validity?	<p>We added the explanation as suggested</p> <p>The Ministry of Health does not publicly publish the data and final report on its website, but the public can access it based on request.</p>
Result and Discussion	The title is a bit misleading, as mostly the result and discussion talk about the predictor factors of NHI membership as a whole and not necessarily about the education factor per se. Overall, I have a sense that the paper has been written in proper academic style.	We changed the title as suggested

Reviewer 2

Page & Line	Reviewers' comments	Authors' revisions
Title	The title should incorporate all of the variables involved in the article, as stated in the research aim in the abstract.	We changed the title as suggested
Abstract	The result part and conclusion should state the influence of other independent variables in this research, not only the education level variable, as stated in the research aim in the abstract.	
Introduction		
	The phrase "during the Covid-19 pandemic, the issuance of Presidential Regulation Number 64 of 2020." on page 3 lines 2-3 should be fixed because it looks like an incomplete phrase for explaining before and after sentences.	We rewrote the background as suggested
	You should add more references in the paragraph on page 3 lines 6-14	We added the referenced as suggested
	Need to add a sentence to conclude facts that are stated on page 3 lines 15-21, to make the idea in the paragraph clearer.	We rewrote the background as suggested
	The paragraph on page 4 lines 8-13 should be revised to make it relevant to the research aims stated in the abstract.	We rewrote the background as suggested
Material and Method		
	a. In the paragraph dealing with the explanation about the data source (Page 4, lines 17-20), it should be clear: 1) where the data came from, whether from the survey conducted by the ministry of health or from a previous study, 2) is the data available for public (available online?) or restricted only for the investigators or could be accessed by the public with special permission? 3) the population of the survey (all provinces in Indonesia?) and the sampling technique should be explained.	Added in the section "Data Source" 1&2: Data availability: by request to the Ministry of Health 3: all provinces, using multistage and stratification
	b. The variables classification (Exposure and Control variables) should be fixed to match the research aim.	We revised the variables list as suggested
	c. The data used for mapping NHI membership should be stated clearly, is it using the same data (survey data) or not?	We added in the section "Data Analysis" as suggested ..., using the same data, ...
Result		

	<p>a. The result from table 1. Especially from education level by type of respondent analysis should be interpreted carefully. If the respondent from rural areas proportion is greater than that from urban areas, the conclusion will be miss leading. If that is the case, then this variable should not be used or you need to be equalized the number of respondents and reanalyzed the data.</p> <p>b. The same case happened with the interpretation of Education level by Age Group analysis which should be done carefully. Respondents from the age group <17 have near zero chance to be graduated from university.</p>	We revised the interpretation as suggested																												
	<p>c. Table 2. should be simplified, the AOR could be combined with the 95% CI and the p-value should be moved to the far-right column, you should put information about the category that becomes a reference, adding the information about the number of the respondent and the percentage of each category will increase the readability.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Predictor</td> <td></td> <td>Member of</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NHI</td> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>AOR (95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CI)</td> <td>P-value</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education: No Education</td> <td>... ref.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education: Primary</td> <td>... 1.454 (1.331 – 1.588)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><0.001*</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Predictor		Member of		NHI		%	AOR (95%	CI)	P-value			Education: No Education	... ref.			-				Education: Primary	... 1.454 (1.331 – 1.588)			<0.001*				We revised the table as suggested
Predictor		Member of																												
NHI		%	AOR (95%																											
CI)	P-value																													
Education: No Education	... ref.																													
-																														
Education: Primary	... 1.454 (1.331 – 1.588)																													
<0.001*																														
Discussion																														
	<p>a. The discussion about the influence of residence on NHI membership should be fixed according to the re-analyzed statistical result after equalizing the rural-urban respondent proportion.</p> <p>b. Overall, authors should discuss results on how they can be interpreted in depth based on evidence, not just by comparing them with</p>	We revised the discussion as suggested																												

	previous research results. If the independent variable had a significant influence on the dependent variable, what mechanism or reason it appeared should be discussed along with appropriate literature citations.	
Conclusion	The conclusion should accommodate all the independent variables that significant in the logistic model.	We revised the conclusion as suggested



Nuzulul Putri <nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id>

BMC Public Health: Decision on your manuscript

5 pesan

BMC Public Health <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>
Kepada: nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id

14 Desember 2022 pukul 15.11

Ref: Submission ID d0d4adc7-de17-4172-92aa-0d85d9f7ebf6

Dear Dr Putri,

Re: "National Health Insurance among the poor in Indonesia: Does education level matter?"

We are pleased to let you know that your manuscript has now passed through the review stage and is ready for revision. Many manuscripts require a round of revisions, so this is a normal but important stage of the editorial process.

Editor comments

The article needs revision as per the reviewer's comments.

To ensure the Editor and Reviewers will be able to recommend that your revised manuscript is accepted, please pay careful attention to each of the comments that have been pasted underneath this email. This way we can avoid future rounds of clarifications and revisions, moving swiftly to a decision.

Once you have addressed each comment and completed each step listed below, the revised submission and final file can be uploaded via the link below.

If you completed the initial submission, please log in using the same email address. If you did not complete the initial submission, please discuss with the submitting author, who will be able to access the link and resubmit.

<https://submission.springernature.com/submit-revision/d0d4adc7-de17-4172-92aa-0d85d9f7ebf6>

You can visit <https://researcher.nature.com/your-submissions> to track progress of this or any other submissions you might have.

CHECKLIST FOR SUBMITTING YOUR REVISION

1. Please upload a point-by-point response to the comments, including a description of any additional experiments that were carried out and a detailed rebuttal of any criticisms or requested revisions that you disagreed with. This must be uploaded as a 'Point-by-point response to reviewers' file.

Please note that we operate a transparent peer review process, where we publish reviewers' reports with the article, together with any responses that you make to reviewers or the handling Editor.

2. Please highlight all the amends on your manuscript or indicate them by using tracked changes.

3. Check the format for revised manuscripts in our submission guidelines, making sure you pay particular attention to the figure resolution requirements:

<https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines>

Finally, if you have been asked to improve the language or presentation of your manuscript and would like the assistance of paid editing services, we can recommend our affiliates, Nature Research Editing Service: <https://authorservices.springernature.com/language-editing/> and American Journal Experts: <https://www.aje.com/go/springernature>

Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our resources page: <https://www.springernature.com/gp/researchers/campaigns/english-language-forauthors>

To support the continuity of the peer review process, we recommend returning your manuscript to us within 14 days. If you think you will need additional time, please let us know and we will aim to respond within 48 hours.

Kind regards,

Dr. Kamalesh Kumar Patel
Editorial Board Member
BMC Public Health

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1

Abstract - I explored other publications on a similar topic, which happened to be authored by the second author of this article, and I found almost similar lines as used in the background and other parts of the abstract. The article's title is appropriate. The abbreviation "NHI" was used without mentioning what it stands for in the abstract.

Introduction - Although I found this section to be a little wordy, I enjoyed reading the facts, which included the history of NHI in Indonesia. I'd like to make it more chronological and logical, such as that mentioned in page 3, lines 1–4, about the fixed insurance premium following presidential regulation issuance. I was curious about how insurance premiums were paid in past years since it says on another line (page 3, line 15) that the NHI was first put into place in 2014. Were the facts presented in lines 5 and 17 of page 3 similarly telling about more than 80% of citizens being covered by the NHI? Please revise lines 17–21, as the facts presented in these lines are confusing. There is no clear introductory explanation about what SSAA is or its role in the NHI. Whether these two are different entities.

Material and methods - Is the poll mentioned in lines 18–19 and its results publicly available to access and to confirm their validity?

Result and Discussion - The title is a bit misleading, as mostly the result and discussion talk about the predictor factors of NHI membership as a whole and not necessarily about the education factor per se. Overall, I have a sense that the paper has been written in proper academic style.

Reviewer 2

Review Report for BMC Journal

Article:

National Health Insurance among the poor in Indonesia: Does education level matter?

Nuzulul Kusuma Putri^{1,2*}, Agung Dwi Laksono^{2,3}, Nikmatur Rohmah⁴

The authors wrote an interesting paper. I find it well-written and with a good research idea.

Below are my suggestions.

1. Title

The title should incorporate all of the variables involved in the article, as stated in the research aim in the abstract.

2. Abstract

The result part and conclusion should state the influence of other independent variables in this research not only the education level variable, as stated in the research aim in the abstract.

3. Introduction

a. The phrase “during the Covid-19 pandemic, the issuance of Presidential Regulation Number 64 of 2020.” on page 3 lines 2-3 should be fixed because it looks like an incomplete phrase for explaining before and after sentences.

b. You should add more references in the paragraph on page 3 lines 6-14

c. Need to add a sentence to conclude facts that are stated on page 3 lines 15-21, to make the idea in the paragraph clearer.

d. The paragraph on page 4 lines 8-13 should be revised to make it relevant to the research aims stated in the abstract.

4. Material and Method

a. In the paragraph dealing with the explanation about the data source (Page 4, lines 17-20), it should be clear: 1) where the data came from, whether from the survey conducted by the ministry of health or from a previous study, 2) is the data available for public (available online?) or restricted only for the investigators or could be accessed by the public with special permission? 3) the population of the survey (all provinces in Indonesia?) and the sampling technique should be explained.

b. The variables classification (Exposure and Control variables) should be fixed to match the research aim.

c. The data used for mapping NHI membership should be stated clearly, is it using the same data (survey data) or not?

5. Result

a. The result from table 1. Especially from education level by type of respondent analysis should be interpreted carefully. If the respondent from rural areas proportion is greater than that from urban areas, the conclusion will be misleading. If that is the case, then this variable should not be used or you need to be equalized the number of respondents and reanalyzed the data.

b. The same case happened with the interpretation of Education level by Age Group analysis which should be done carefully. Respondents from the age group <17 have near zero chance to be graduated from university.

c. Table 2. should be simplified, the AOR could be combined with the 95% CI and the p-value should be moved to the far-right column, you should put information about the category that becomes a reference, adding the information about the number of the respondent and the percentage of each category will increase the readability.

Predictor	Member of NHI		P-value
	%	AOR (95% CI)	
Education: No Education ... ref.			-
Education: Primary ...	1.454	(1.331 – 1.588)	<0.001*

6. Discussion

- The discussion about the influence of residence on NHI membership should be fixed according to the re-analyzed statistical result after equalizing the rural-urban respondent proportion.
- Overall, authors should discuss results on how they can be interpreted in depth based on evidence, not just by comparing them with previous research results. If the independent variable had a significant influence on the dependent variable, what mechanism or reason it appeared should be discussed along with appropriate literature citations.

7. Conclusion

The conclusion should accommodate all the independent variables that significant in the logistic model.

Nuzulul Putri <nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id>
Kepada: BMC Public Health <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>

29 Desember 2022 pukul 14.37

Dear Dr. Kamalesh Kumar Patel,

I am sorry that I just read the e-mail to revise the manuscript right now. I have been on my annual leave since three weeks ago and not checking e-mail. I am just aware that I need to submit the revision before the deadline, which was yesterday. Please let me know if I still have a chance to submit it. I will try to submit it as soon as possible next week.

Best wishes,

Nuzulul Kusuma Putri, [S.KM.](#), M.Kes.
Department of Health Administration and Policy
Faculty of Public Health
Universitas Airlangga
+62 822 3059 1613

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

Pornima Jagtap <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>
Balas Ke: Pornima Jagtap <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>
Kepada: nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id

29 Desember 2022 pukul 18.41

Dear Dr Putri,

Thank you for your email.

This will not be a problem, we do appreciate that some revisions do take longer than others and we would be more than happy to accommodate an extension for you.

Please let me know the **tentative date** as for when you will be able to submit the revised manuscript. I will give you the extension accordingly.

Kind Regards,
Pornima Jagtap
Editorial Support at [BMC](#)

On Thu, 29 Dec at 7:37 AM , Nuzululkusuma <nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id> wrote:

[External - Use Caution]

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

Nuzulul Putri <nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id>
Kepada: Pornima Jagtap <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>

30 Desember 2022 pukul 17.46

Dear Dr Jagtap,

Thank you so much for your understanding. We are working on the revision right now. We hope we can address the reviewers' comments before the end of next week. Please let me know if it is okay to have an extension until 8 January. However, we will work hard to send it before the extension deadline.

Best regards,

Nuzulul Kusuma Putri, [S.KM.](#), M.Kes.
Department of Health Administration and Policy
Faculty of Public Health
Universitas Airlangga
+62 822 3059 1613

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

Pornima Jagtap <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>
Balas Ke: Pornima Jagtap <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>
Kepada: nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id

30 Desember 2022 pukul 18.01

Dear Dr Putri,

Thank you for your email.

Your extension has been granted and now, I have set the deadline of the submission to 8th January, 2023. Please submit the revised manuscript on or before 8th January, 2023.

Please feel free to contact us for any further queries.

Kind Regards,
Pornima Jagtap
Editorial Support at [BMC](#)

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

Peer Review Round 2

Page	Editor's comments	Revision
all	The manuscript needs extensive revision for language and grammar.	In this second round of review, we proofread the manuscript as suggested.
Abstract	The keywords used for publication search need to be revised.	We replaced the keywords as suggested. We replaced the poor, health policy, big data, population survey, public health which are too general explaining our manuscript. Currently we used education, National Health Insurance, Universal Health Coverage, disparity, social security.
Background, discussion	The innovations of this manuscript are limited. There is a need for more attention in the context of policy and implementation.	To raise more attention of readers on the policy context, we put more explanation in the Background on how the poor population are managed in the NHI implementation in Indonesia. We also explained the context of Indonesia at the discussion and recommendation.
Background, discussion	Authors should revise better to include current literature in the manuscript.	In the background section, we added several most recent publication which discussed how education level impacted health: Ngaruiya C, Bernstein R, Leff R, Wallace L, Agrawal P, Selvam A, et al. Systematic review on chronic non-communicable disease in disaster settings. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2022;22(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13399-z Wulandari RD, Laksono AD, Mubasyiroh R, Rachmalina R, Ipa M, Rohmah N. Hospital utilization among urban poor in Indonesia in 2018: is government-run insurance effective?

		<p>BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2023;23(1):92. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15017-y</p> <p>In the discussion, we added several most recent publications to help us explained how the education determine individual membership on health insurance, including making comparation on the international context:</p> <p>Laksono, A. D. <i>et al.</i> (2023) ‘Policy to expand hospital utilization in disadvantaged areas in Indonesia: who should be the target?’, <i>BMC public health</i>. BioMed Central, 23(1), p. 12. doi: 10.1186/s12889-022-14656-x.</p> <p>Osei Afriyie, D. <i>et al.</i> (2022) ‘Equity in health insurance schemes enrollment in low and middle-income countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis’, <i>International Journal for Equity in Health</i>. BioMed Central, 21(1), pp. 1–12. doi: 10.1186/s12939-021-01608-x.</p> <p>Wulandari, R. D. <i>et al.</i> (2023) ‘Hospital utilization among urban poor in Indonesia in 2018: is government-run insurance effective?’, <i>BMC public health</i>. BioMed Central, 23(1), p. 92. doi: 10.1186/s12889-023-15017-y.</p>
--	--	---



Nuzulul Putri <nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id>

BMC Public Health: Decision on your manuscript

2 pesan

BMC Public Health <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>
Kepada: nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id

25 Januari 2023 pukul 13.21

Ref: Submission ID d0d4adc7-de17-4172-92aa-0d85d9f7ebf6

Dear Dr Putri,

Re: "Predictors of National Health Insurance membership among the poor with different education levels in Indonesia"

We are pleased to let you know that your manuscript has now passed through the review stage and is ready for revision. Many manuscripts require a round of revisions, so this is a normal but important stage of the editorial process.

Editor comments

The article has been accepted with the following minor revisions:

1. The manuscript needs extensive revision for language and grammar.
2. The keywords used for publication search need to be revised.
3. The innovations of this manuscript are limited. There is a need for more attention in the context of policy and implementation.
4. Authors should revise better to include current literature in the manuscript.

To ensure the Editor and Reviewers will be able to recommend that your revised manuscript is accepted, please pay careful attention to each of the comments that have been pasted underneath this email. This way we can avoid future rounds of clarifications and revisions, moving swiftly to a decision.

Once you have addressed each comment and completed each step listed below, the revised submission and final file can be uploaded via the link below.

If you completed the initial submission, please log in using the same email address. If you did not complete the initial submission, please discuss with the submitting author, who will be able to access the link and resubmit.

<https://submission.springernature.com/submit-revision/d0d4adc7-de17-4172-92aa-0d85d9f7ebf6>

You can visit <https://researcher.nature.com/your-submissions> to track progress of this or any other submissions you might have.

CHECKLIST FOR SUBMITTING YOUR REVISION

1. Please upload a point-by-point response to the comments, including a description of any additional experiments that were carried out and a detailed rebuttal of any criticisms or requested revisions that you disagreed with. This must be uploaded as a 'Point-by-point response to reviewers' file.

Please note that we operate a transparent peer review process, where we publish reviewers' reports with the article, together with any responses that you make to reviewers or the handling Editor.

2. Please highlight all the amends on your manuscript or indicate them by using tracked changes.
3. Check the format for revised manuscripts in our submission guidelines, making sure you pay particular attention to the figure resolution requirements:

<https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines>

Finally, if you have been asked to improve the language or presentation of your manuscript and would like the assistance of paid editing services, we can recommend our affiliates, Nature Research Editing Service: <https://authorservices.springernature.com/language-editing/> and American Journal Experts: <https://www.aje.com/go/springernature>

Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is

available from our resources page: <https://www.springernature.com/gp/researchers/campaigns/english-language-forauthors>

To support the continuity of the peer review process, we recommend returning your manuscript to us within 14 days. If you think you will need additional time, please let us know and we will aim to respond within 48 hours.

Kind regards,

Dr. Kamalesh Kumar Patel
Editorial Board Member
BMC Public Health

Nuzulul Putri <nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id>
Kepada: Angelo Ercia <aenercia06@gmail.com>

27 Januari 2023 pukul 18.53

Nuzulul Kusuma Putri, [S.KM.](#), M.Kes.
Department of Health Administration and Policy
Faculty of Public Health
Universitas Airlangga
+62 822 3059 1613
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



Nuzulul Putri <nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id>

BMC Public Health: Decision on your manuscript

BMC Public Health <bmcpublichealth@biomedcentral.com>

20 Februari 2023 pukul 11.23

Kepada: nuzululkusuma@fkm.unair.ac.id

Ref: Submission ID d0d4adc7-de17-4172-92aa-0d85d9f7ebf6

Dear Dr Putri,

Re: "Predictors of National Health Insurance membership among the poor with different education levels in Indonesia"

We're delighted to let you know that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in BMC Public Health.

Editor comments

The manuscript look good after revision. The revised manuscript may be accepted for the publication.

Prior to publication, our production team will check the format of your manuscript to ensure that it conforms to the standards of the journal. They will be in touch shortly to request any necessary changes, or to confirm that none are needed.

Checking the proofs

Once we've prepared your paper for publication, you will receive a proof. At this stage, please check that the author list and affiliations are correct. For the main text, only errors that have been introduced during the production process, or those that directly compromise the scientific integrity of the paper, may be corrected.

Please make sure that only one author communicates with us and that only one set of corrections is returned. As the corresponding (or nominated) author, you are responsible for the accuracy of all content, including spelling of names and current affiliations.

To ensure prompt publication, your proofs should be returned within two working days.

Publication policies

Acceptance of your manuscript is conditional on all authors agreeing to our publication policies at:
<https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies>

Please note that we operate a transparent peer review process, where we publish reviewers' reports with the article, together with any responses that you may have made to reviewers or the handling Editor.

Licence to Publish and Article Processing Charge

As the corresponding author of an accepted manuscript, your next steps will be to complete an Open Access Licence to publish on behalf of all authors, confirm your institutional affiliation, and arrange payment of your article-processing charge (APC). You will shortly receive an email with more information.

Once again, thank you for choosing BMC Public Health, and we look forward to publishing your article.

Kind regards,

Dr. Kamallesh Kumar Patel
Editorial Board Member
BMC Public HealthP.S. If you wish to co-submit a data note to be published in BMC Research Notes (<https://bmcrnotes.biomedcentral.com/about/introducing-data-notes>) you can do so by visiting our submission portal

4/1/23, 7:09 AM

Email Airlangga University - BMC Public Health: Decision on your manuscript

<http://www.editorialmanager.com/resn/>. Data notes support open data (<https://www.springernature.com/gp/open-research/open-data>) and help authors to comply with funder policies on data sharing. Please note that this additional service is entirely optional.