

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Loneliness and Depression among Female University Students during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-sectional Study in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Stephen Lindow

Submitted on: 11 Mar 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604885

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

A cross sectional study of female students looking at their loneliness and depression related to Covid isolation.

There were significant numbers of women with loneliness and depressive symptoms when assessed on a self assessment score.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations are addressed in the article. These are that only females are sampled and only once and there is a lack of baseline data that pre dates the covid era.

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 study was well written and easy to follow. The results are discussed with the relevant literature cited.

I have one relevant suggestion; there should be an additional figure added with both the actual ULS-8 and the PHQ-9 scores plotted against the numbers of respondents. This would give a better idea of the problem that a mean score does not. Many respondents will score lowly and this is not clear at present.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Female should be added

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes but 1 problem.

The conclusion is clumsily written in both the abstract and the text. To state loneliness and depression are prevalent is meaningless and the exact prevalence should be stated.

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

No.

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:

Minor revisions.