

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on SENSE OF COHERENCE IN HEALTHCARE WORKERS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN ECUADOR: ASSOCIATION WITH WORK ENGAGEMENT, WORK ENVIRONMENT AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS FACTORS

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Jimmy Martin-Delgado

Submitted on: 18 Oct 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1605428

### EVALUATION

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

The authors include a large sample of healthcare workers from Ecuador. They use 3 validated instruments to measure SOC, WE and PD. Expectable but interesting results were found.

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

Limitations:

Cross-sectional design

Sample splitting in the methods.

Time-lag

More analyses between settings, place of work, higher or lower risk (place of work), public or private institutions, and other variables relevant in this type of studies.

Strengths:

803 sample

Use of instruments

Relevant analysis of data

#### **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.

Please correct your abstract to the correct numbers of participants' data analyzed (803) as 1235 could be misleading.

Avoid the term provinces, as this could be hard to understand for international readership.

Introduction lines 73 - 81 could be interesting to mention the work from Mira

(<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042555>) one of the very few from 2020 to collect data at 4 different time points of the first 2 waves of the pandemic in Spain.

Methods

It would be useful to include as a supplementary file the questionnaire.

Table 1. What are the possible answers to these questions? How were these measured?

Which validated version of the instruments was used? For the GHQ there are some validated in the region (which one) and how about the others

Results

Is there any study addressing the MCID of the SOC-13 Scale? How are these values interpreted? What does 2 or 3 points difference (from a range of 13 to 91) means? This is important.

Table 3. I am guessing this was measured on a 1 to 10 scale? But I have no certainty of it. Since it has not been previously mentioned in the methods. Why is there a difference between pre and post N of respondents?

Table 4. My previous comments (MCID) gain more relevance with this information. What does it mean a 2 - 4 points difference between groups if the SD of the SOC is 12.74.

I think there is an erratum in table 4 "Psico".

Suggestion, to avoid rewriting all of the questions from table 1, why not mention "Table 1"?

#### General comments

Is it possible to analyze between services? Place of work (higher or lower risk)? Public or private institutions? And other variables relevant in this type of study? If not, this should be pointed out in the limitations.

#### Limitations

Why is the education level a limitation? It makes sense to me if it is a general population sample, but in this case, is targeted at healthcare workers.

### PLEASE COMMENT

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

I am not sure if authors have addressed "Mental Health". This could be misleading as they have not measured this and it is not even included in the methods, results and conclusions.

#### Q 5 → Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

#### Q 6 → Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Minor editing is needed.

#### 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.