Peer Review Report

Review Report on Life satisfaction before and during COVID-19 pandemic in Thailand
Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Luiz Alexandre Chisini
Submitted on: 15 May 2023
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605483

EVALUATION

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

No answer given.

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

– This study presents an interesting objective in the scope of the International Journal of Public Health and the main strength is the longitudinal design. However, the methods of study are poorly reported. The sampling process is described shortly reported and is not possible to understand if the study is representative or not of the population. Variables are briefly described and Inclusion/exclusion criteria are not reported. Moreover, I have consistent concerns about the statistical approach adopted. The authors did not describe properly the statistical methods used, reporting only generically the term "regression". So, it is impossible to understand the statistical process properly. Seems that the regression was only a bivariate analysis. The authors could use valid categorization of the outcome and use logistic regression (if the data distribution corroborates, for example) reporting odds ratio to better interpretation of the results. Also, considering the longitudinal design of the study, the authors could use a Multilevel Mixed-Effects Model, considering each follow-up and level. In this way, could be possible to analyze properly the data from a longitudinal perspective.

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.**

Abstract:
– What was the sample selection method?
– What was the survey response and loss rate?
– The result of the main objective of the study (prevalence of life satisfaction) was not presented in the abstract. Please, add the information for 2019 and 2021
– How the outcome was assessed? It is important to clarify the instrument in the abstract.
– Please, present results of estimates (ODDS or p-values, for example) in the results.
– What kind of Multiple regression analysis? Logistic? The authors need to specify it.
Introduction
– Considering the international scope of the International Journal of Public Health, the authos should present complementary data from other countries and not only from the Thai population.

Methods
– The methods section of study missing important informations. I suggest to the authors the use of STROBE checklist for longitudinal studies: https://www.strobe-statement.org/checklists/
– The sampling procedure is poorly described. Please give more detail about the sampling procedures in both of the waves.
– Were all house participants interviewed? or were they selected by sampling processes?
– Which cities were part of the sample? how were they selected?

- Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
- Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up
- Explain how the study size was arrived at
- The authors should to present all questions used in the study and possibles answers. Besides, should report how the variables quere categorized.
- Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
- Data analysis is poorly descripted. Which type of multivariate regression analysis was used in the study? The authors used a Forward and Backward Stepwise Regression method. Moreover, considering that the data are longitudinal, the authors did not report how they were handled.
- Why did the authors use the t test? This statistical approach only allows the comparison of two means. Thus, the authors only compared each category of each covariate and its change over time, which does not allow extrapolation of the association to the variable as a whole.
- Considering that the present study presents longitudinal data, why did the authors not consider using Multilevel Mixed-Effects Models?
- Did the authos not investigate

Results
- Based on which reference the authors categorized the outcome scores as: "(1) Less life satisfaction (scores 5-20); and 161 (2) More life satisfaction (scores 21-35)" Did this categorization used too into the regression?
-

Discussion
- In the limitations you do not explore the level of attrition in this study and the potential bias associated with this.
- The authors reported in the methods that the individuals were "interviewed", however, in the discussion they presents that the questionnaire was "self-administered". Which one is correct?

Tables:
- In Table 3, the only possibility that the authors used the T test is that they performed the analyzes within the same line, thus, the p value should have been presented adjacent to where the test was carried out.

PLEASE COMMENT

> **Q 4** **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

The title could be improved

> **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?**

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:

Reject.