

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Psychological distress, anxiety, depression, and associated factors among Nigerian healthcare workers during COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Zeyu Li

Submitted on: 11 Sep 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604835

### EVALUATION

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

The study aimed to investigate the associations between sociodemographic factors, anxiety, depression, and COVID-19-related working experiences, and psychological distress among healthcare workers in two tertiary health facilities in Nigeria. The authors found that women, nurses, respondents with first degree, and respondents with specific COVID-19-related factors were more likely to experience psychological distress. Associations between profession, anxiety, depression and psychological distress were observed.

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

Overall, the current study was well designed with standard quality and clearly showed important findings about the mental health of healthcare workers. These outcomes reported in the manuscript will be of interest to readers in their field. Nevertheless, the authors only elaborated the significance of exploring associations between psychological distress and COVID-19 related working experience. I would suggest that they could provide more reasons why they evaluated the associations between anxiety, depression and psychological distress, which will give readers a clearer understanding of the topic.

#### **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 quality of the manuscript will be improved if the following concerns/questions were addressed.

[Comments 1 to 5 are all about the abstract]

1. The abstracts shown in two places were different, please check which one is the final version.
2. The description of associations in objectives section of abstract is confusing. The readers don't know what the objects of the associations were. I would suggest replacing "the associations between COVID-19-related psychological distress, anxiety, and depression among healthcare workers" with "the associations between sociodemographic factors, anxiety, depression, and COVID-19-related experiences, and psychological distress".
3. There are two "anxiety" in the methods section of abstract. I guess the first "anxiety (Patient Health Questionnaire- 9)" should be "depression (Patient Health Questionnaire- 9)".
4. The full name of HCW was not shown clearly in the abstract before it appeared for the first time.
5. Please add the statistical analysis in the methods section of abstract.
6. Lines 28, reference is missing to support the statement.
7. Information is missing on how the sociodemographic factors were collected.
8. Did the authors compare the differences of explanatory characteristics of HCWs in two hospitals? The educational levels or economic statuses may be different, contributing to different psychological distress levels.

9. Could the authors provide more details about the COVID-19-related factors, such as the precise definition of “a history of exposure”?
10. Lines 141, Chi-square is not used for evaluating associations. I suggest you describe it as compare the differences.
11. Did the authors consider the collinearities of sex and educational level, or profession and educational level (women were more likely to have lower educational levels, or nurses were more likely to have lower educational levels)? Women, nurses, and HCWs with lower academic qualifications were more likely to have high psychological distress, did the authors try to overcome the potential confounding bias?
12. Lines 257, reference is missing to support the statement.

**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.