

Peer Review Report

Review Report on PRIMARY CARE PHYSICIANS' PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED WITH FORGOING OWN CARE AND PRESENTEEISM: A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Jean-Francois Chenot

Submitted on: 17 Oct 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2021.1604442

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

A significant proportion of General Practitioners in French-speaking Switzerland is forgoing own medical care and continues to work despite sickness (presenteeism). This poses a threat to the work force and the population they care for. Presenteeism was associated with female gender and chronic diseases.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This is the first study on the subject in Switzerland and addresses subject which is rarely investigated. Despite an excellent participation rate of 50% response bias cannot be excluded. The study is restricted to GPs, which is appropriate since continuity of care is a key characteristic of primary care.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

This is a well written manuscript on a relevant public health issue, the health of the primary care work force. I have only few suggestions to improve the manuscript.

The title should include presenteeism

The abstract reflects the content of the manuscript.

Introduction

I like the quintuple aim in the introduction. But this would benefit from a little elaboration. I had to look it up. Statistical analysis.

You might want to say something about the goodness of fit of the regression models and how you assessed it. Reporting R^2 to get an estimate of proportion of variance attributable to the predictors in the model would be great.

Discussion

You have cited work from Sendén, but not :

Gustafsson Sendén M, Schenck-Gustafsson K, Fridner A. Gender differences in Reasons for Sickness Presenteeism – a study among GPs in a Swedish health care organization. Ann Occup Environ Med. 2016 Sep 20;28:50.

This manuscript confirms your finding that presenteeism is more frequent in female

Strength and limitations are adequately discussed.

Conclusion

The conclusions are in line with your findings.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

I would suggest including presenteeism in the title.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

The key words are appropriate.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

I found no language problems.

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

Yes.

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

Gustafsson Sendén M, Schenck-Gustafsson K, Fridner A. Gender differences in Reasons for Sickness Presenteeism – a study among GPs in a Swedish health care organization. *Ann Occup Environ Med.* 2016 Sep 20;28:50.

which also observed presenteeism to be more frequent in female GPs.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.