Peer Review Report

Review Report on Associations between COVID-19-related Health, Healthcare Changes and Economic Factors with Prenatal Depression and Anxiety

Original Article, Int J Public Health

EVALUATION

| Q 1 | Please summarize the main findings of the study. |

Over one third of individuals reported depression or anxiety symptoms. In multivariable analysis, COVID-19 during pregnancy, employment with greater risk of COVID-19, distress over changes in prenatal care, job loss, changes in childcare and food insecurity were associated with greater odds of prenatal depression or anxiety.

Those individuals who responded to the survey were more likely to be white, less likely to have MEDICAID, more likely to have their first pregnancy, and more likely to have their first pregnancy than those who did not respond to the survey.

Individuals who reported having COVID-19 during pregnancy were more likely to report moderate or severe depression and severe anxiety symptoms compared to those who did not report having COVID-19. In addition, those who were food insecure were more likely to have depressive symptoms and anxiety, relative to those who were not food insecure.

Individuals who lost their job had higher odds of depression, but not anxiety compared to individuals who did not lose their job; however, the estimate for severe depression was less precise. Individuals with COVID-19-related childcare challenges had increased odds of depression compared to individuals who did not have childcare impacted by COVID-19.

Food insecurity was significantly associated with both depression and anxiety with the association doubling between moderate and severe levels of depression and anxiety.

| Q 2 | Please highlight the limitations and strengths. |

Limitations: There was a low response rate, as reported by the authors. Therefore, this bias could affect the results. Even so, the authors considered this bias when performing the respective analyses.

On the other hand, the cross-sectional design does not allow causality to be established. In addition, the instruments used to establish depressive and anxiety symptoms consider a limited period of time (2 weeks).

Strengths: A large sample size, with different sociodemographic characteristics. It is also conducted during the height of the pandemic, when governments took the most restrictive measures.

The study is conducted in a population that is predictably more vulnerable, so it is important to understand the impact of the pandemic on this group.

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.

The study is interesting from the point of view of the target population, as it is a vulnerable group with little information on how the pandemic has affected them.

The sample size is large, which is a strength, as they report. As are the diverse sociodemographic characteristics of the group.

Regarding the tests, I have doubts regarding the estimation of food insecurity, as I understand that they did not use a specific test. This is important, since there are validated surveys that could have been used in this case and that consider various dimensions. Given this, it would be good to delve deeper into this or justify why they chose this way of determining food insecurity.

The statistical analysis, results, discussion and conclusions, I believe, are pertinent to the objectives of the study.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 ▶ Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 5 ▶ Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 ▶ Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

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?)

The references are adequate for the brief

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 ▶ Originality — 5/5

Q 10 ▶ Rigor — 4/5

Q 11 ▶ Significance to the field — 5/5

Q 12 ▶ Interest to a general audience — 5/5

Q 13 ▶ Quality of the writing — 4/5

Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.