

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Barriers to COVID-19 preventive behaviors Barriers to Practicing COVID-19 Preventive Behaviors among Migrant Workers in Qatar: A Qualitative Study during the First Wave of the Pandemic in 2020

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Dewi Susanna

Submitted on: 05 Apr 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604881

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The objective to be sought has been found, but the final goal has not been formulated, as mentioned in the last paragraph in the introduction. The authors want to make a plan for communication strategies related to preventive measures and give information regarding healthcare policies and plans addressing the MACWs communities. This recommendation must be formulated in the last part of the conclusion.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

There are some limitations; to make the research better in the future, the authors may give some suggestions to the following researchers.

The strengths have not described yet.

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.

1. Introduction

- The introduction is too long. The authors suggested making it more precise and more concise.
- Sub-section and links of a source of information or references in the introduction are not expected.

2. Methods:

- It should be mentioned which participants to interview individually and participate in focus group discussion.
- Data analysis must be in detail what were the authors did to get the result, as shown in the result section.

Examples:

- o how to make thematic analysis;
- o how to combine the results of the individual interview and FGD;
- o Is there a triangulation analysis? How was it done?
- o Etc

- The study's proposal was reviewed and approved by Qatar's Ministry of Public Health 187 (MOPH). Committee Ethics approved it? Please show the number of the letter from the Committee Ethics.

3. Results

- The characteristics of participants should be described first to make the reader more understand who the informants were, such as code of participants (#1, #2, #3, etc.), age group, country of origin, sex, type of jobs, etc.).
- The quotations only come from the FGD, even though there are results from individual interviews.
- The quotation only came from one person; Supposedly, the same opinion on one theme can come from several participants.

- The narrative in the results seems to be a subjective author's opinion because it is not known whether the source was from individual interviews or FGDs.
- Besides discussing the finding, the authors also need to discuss the possibility for recommendations or suggestions to any parties such as government, stakeholders, company, etc.
- There are some limitations; to make the research better in the future, the authors may give some suggestions to the following researchers.

4. Conclusion:

The objective to be sought has been found, but the final goal has not been formulated, as mentioned in the last paragraph in the introduction. The authors want to make a plan for communication strategies related to preventive measures and give information regarding healthcare policies and plans addressing the MACWs communities. This recommendation must be formulated in the last part of the conclusion.

5. References

- Some statements in the discussion need references because I thought that the statements belonged to someone or institutions.
- Add some more references regarding the comments above.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes, the titles is appropriate, concise, and attractive

Q 5 → Are the keywords appropriate?

I think it need to add one more keyword: prevention behaviour

Q 6 → Is the English language of sufficient quality?

It needs a professional English Services.

Q 7 → Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Not Applicable.

Q 8 → Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes, partly.

- Some statements in the discussion need references because I thought that the statements belonged to someone or institutions.
- Add some more references regarding the comments above.
- a link in the introduction not needed, because it is not common.

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.