Peer Review Report

Review Report on Socioeconomic status, the countries' socioeconomic development and mental health: Observational evidence for persons with spinal cord injury from 22 countries

Original Article, Int J Public Health

EVALUATION

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

The main findings of this study are
1) No association of country level SED with mental health of SCI
2) Among SES indicators only financial harder ship and subjective status associated with Mental Health (MH) of people with SCI
3) Perceived financial harder ship is negatively associated with MH while Subjective status associated with positively.
4) Higher HDI was robustly associated with better mental health

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

There are few limitations in this study
Generalizability of the results is limited due to use of convenient sampling method for 14 countries.
Even though the sample represent all the continents there are huge differences can be seen in some countries in the same continent. As an example, south Asian region's socio economical status is different than the other countries in the Asia.
Difficulty in comparing income situation in selected countries

Strengths are
large number of participants from 22 countries represent all the continents in the world.

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.**

No answer given.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes, The title is appropriately describes the study

Q 5   **Are the keywords appropriate?**

Yes, there are seven key words

Q 6   **Is the English language of sufficient quality?**

There are few spelling mistakes were found.

line 69 Mai should be May.
Line 96, use proper name before use abbreviation

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** — 4/5

Q 10 **Rigor** — 3/5

Q 11 **Significance to the field** — 5/5

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

Q 13 **Quality of the writing** — 3/5

Q 14 **Overall scientific quality of the study** — 4/5

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 **Please make a recommendation based on your comments:**

Minor revisions.