

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Mental health inequities amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Findings from three rounds of a cross-sectional monitoring survey of Canadian adults

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Yagoub Al-Kandari

Submitted on: 15 Apr 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604685

### EVALUATION

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

It has shown significant disparities in the mental health consequences of the pandemic, with inequitable impacts for sub-groups who experience structural vulnerability related to pre-existing mental health conditions, disability, LGBTQ2+ identity, and Indigenous identity.

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

Sample was representative of the Canadian population by age, gender, region, and income only. Other variables not included. Also, the survey was delivered online, thus with technology barriers are not reflected in the sample. In addition this study did not use standardized clinical measures of mental health conditions.

#### **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.

In general, the research's aim posted in the paper is well defined. Author(s) addressed the major objectives of this manuscript as to characterize the mental and substance use; and to quantify the independent risks of experiencing adverse mental health outcomes for structurally vulnerable population sub-groups, while adjusting for age, gender and survey round. The discussion section of the text is well-balanced and properly supported by the data and results. Abstract, introduction, methodology, discussion and conclusion are well described and written.

I am happy to recommend this paper to be published in the International Journal of Public Health with minor concerns. Here are some suggestions:

1. It is noticed that the theoretical framework was under the method section. I recommend that this section should be a separate subtitle. It is not a methodology.
2. In the sample and procedure section, author(s) stated that a random sample was used. More explanation is needed about how this sample was selected.
3. Under the same section, it looks like the response rate was small. How does this small response rate did not affect the results.
4. Sample description is needed in the method section, not in the result's. I recommend that the first paragraph in the result section should be moved to the method section, under the sample and procedures subtitle.
5. In the end of the statistical analysis, how many participants who chose not to answer the question.
6. No information has been given for validity and reliability in the measurement section.
7. In the measurement section, author(s) stated that some items were modified and questions were added. What are they? Give examples.

### 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?)

Yes in general.

#### 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.