

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Examining American Adult's Mental Well- and Ill-Being During the 2020 COVID-19 Pandemic using a Self-Determination Theory Perspective

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Rodrigo Goycolea

Submitted on: 16 Dec 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604508

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The COVID-19 pandemic has led to dramatic shifts in much of life, including how individuals work, maintain relationships, and accomplish daily tasks. Our participants reported a wide range of mental health experiences during the pandemic, with most doing relatively well.

Satisfaction and frustration of autonomy, competence, and relatedness explained significant amounts of variance in multiple indices of well-being and ill-being. Of particular interest was the unique importance of autonomy satisfaction, which predicted more well-being and less ill-being.

This may indicate that it is important for people to feel a sense of choicefulness, especially during periods of high restriction which serve to protect the health and safety of everyone. Public health experts may try to encourage people to maintain choicefulness, finding things that they intrinsically enjoy doing, especially during lockdowns when autonomy may be especially threatened. In sum, our findings represent an important addition in our understanding of mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as an important contribution to the self-determination theory literature regarding the relationship between need frustration and well- and ill-being

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations

It is unclear whether people were especially sensitive to changes in autonomy and competence during the COVID-19 pandemic, a time characterized by increased regulation and much uncertainty, or whether similar results would emerge outside of the pandemic.

The types of people providing data online during a pandemic may differ in important ways from the general population (e.g., access to the internet, more time at home)

The sample is insufficient for the conclusions to be extrapolated to the general population

Not having considered studying a particular group

Strengths

It is a strength that the article considers its limitations and possible future research

Updated and abundant bibliography

The use of methodologies is a strength

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 statistical methods are correct, suggestion for a future study to increase the sample, stratify and have some focus groups to understand and deepen why these results are obtained. The study is replicable using the description of the method. The results are correctly stated, the interpretation of the results is correct, no forced conclusions are extrapolated or that are not supported by the research data

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

In my opinion the title lacks precision.

1.-Examining Mental Well- and Ill-Being During the COVID-19 Pandemic using a Self-Determination Theory Perspective in the American adult population during the year 2020.

2.- Examining Mental Well- and Ill-Being During the COVID-19 Pandemic in the American adult population during the year 2020.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

If they are correct

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

In my opinion the English language is correct, however I am not a native English speaker

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?)

You could consider a bibliography from Latin America or from an international organization such as WHO or PAHO

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.