

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Original article: The Corona Immunitas digital follow-Up eCohort to monitor impacts of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Switzerland: Study protocol and first results

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Mansour Shamsipour

Submitted on: 24 Oct 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604506

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Dear Editorial

This study titled as Corona Immunitas Digital Follow-Up (CI-DFU) eCohort aimed to longitudinally follow Corona Immunitas seroprevalence study participants and through this paper aimed to describe the rationale, organization, and procedures of the CI-DFU and to characterize participants at baseline and to evaluate characteristics associated with participation and compliance of participants through multiple weekly and monthly follow up assessments. Briefly, as of February 2021, 4636 participants were enrolled and 85,693 weekly and 27,817 monthly questionnaires were collected.

Individuals aged 65 years and older and people with higher household income were more likely to have participated, participants without a Swiss citizenship were less likely compared to individuals with a Swiss citizenship. Having a university diploma was associated with a higher retention.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The main drawback of manuscript is that exact variables of Content of follow-up assessments were not clearly presented, In other hand the variables or proxy measures definition, results, and results trend through various follow up visits for preventive measures, societal perception, socioeconomic, vaccine uptake, etc. was not reported.

Given the high frequency of questionnaires the participation rate during different study stages should be reported for evaluation of retention and compliance.

Figure 1. Timeline of enrolment during Corona Immunitas Phase 2 (June 2020–October2020) , is forgotten

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 main drawback of manuscript is that exact variables of Content of follow-up assessments were not clearly presented, In other hand the variables or proxy measures definition, results, and results trend through various follow up visits for preventive measures, societal perception, socioeconomic, vaccine uptake, etc. was not reported.

Given the high frequency of questionnaires the participation rate during different study stages should be reported for evaluation of retention and compliance.

Figure 1. Timeline of enrolment during Corona Immunitas Phase 2 (June 2020–October2020) , is forgotten

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

It is ok but i I think the phrase " feasibility assessment" can be added in Title and method and material.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

population impact is not appropriate keyword

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?)

YES

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11 Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 12 Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.