Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Prospective associations between social connectedness and mental health. Evidence from a longitudinal survey and health insurance claims data.

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Nicolas Sommet
Submitted on: 14 Mar 2022
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604710

## EVALUATION

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

The present piece uses a two-wave dataset collected by the authors to test the link b/w social capital and the likelihood of receiving a diagnosis of depression or anxiety. The paper has many strengths: The topic of investigation is societally important, the authors rely on a large longitudinal sample, and they use objective mental health indicators. I have, however, three series of important concerns: (1) there is a discrepancy between the conceptualization and operationalization of social capital, (2) the models are problematic in various instances and do not enable one to approach causality, and (3) the materials, datasets, and scripts should be made available.

Note that I agreed with the Editor that I was not using the Frontiers-typical forum (which I really dislike) but, rather, a more traditional review letter. This review letter can be found in the attached; in the event of an R&R, I would appreciate if the authors offered a point-by-point response to my comments in a similar document.

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

See the attached

**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.**

See the attached

## 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

## 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:

Major revisions.