Peer Review Report

Review Report on The impact of being homeless on the clinical outcomes of COVID-19: systematic review

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Simon Ducarroz
Submitted on: 05 Apr 2023
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605893

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main theme of the review.**

I read with interest this article about different COVID-19 outcomes in homeless populations, as well as mediators and health inequalities. This interesting study appears to be well conducted and clearly presented, and is worth publication, provided a clarification is given on the methodology for article selection.

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

Strenghts: this systematic review provides a summary of evidence of the pandemic in homeless populations, more similar to the European context.

Limitations: the body of evidence is still rapidly growing and current reviews will soon be partial/outdated

Q 3 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.**

MAJOR
- relevant articles in the scope and methods of this systematic review appear to be missing: e.g. depression and vaccine hesitancy in homeless populations in France (2 papers published in 2021). Clarifications on the methodology is necessary to understand why not all articles are included, otherwise this study would more likely be a scoping review.

MINOR
- l108, regarding the comment of the US systematic review, I wonder why the authors haven't exclude research in homeless shelters from this review which aims at better relevance to the UK context
- l150, relevance of reference lists that were checked could be detailed
- l205, title of section 4 is missing
- l208, given the rapidly growing literature on the pandemic, it would make sense to specifiy when the search was conducted
- Fig1, numbers do not match. If you identified 8233 records and excluded 4183, then you should have screened 4050 and not 4183. Similarly, excluded references at the screening step: 59+42+3778 does not equal 3994
- l369, authors report qualitative results of the impact of the pandemic, it woul dhavebeen instructive to differentiate between specific pandemic-related measures e.g. lockdown, curfew, etc.
l508, authors report as a limittion the sutides that did not document vaccination rates. It's likely that part of them were conducted at a time when covid19-vaccines weren't available or solely for other groupes of population (care givers, elderly, etc.). It would help to provide this piece of information - if indicated in the articles.
l519, lack of studies exploring the potential role of ethnicity is mentioned. To our knowledge, at least one study from France did cover that, although not retained here (cf. major limitation mentioned above)

- l144, Appendix B mentioned but is missing in the file, similarly for Appendix D at l149

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

As mentioned as a major comment, the methodology for selection of articles need to be clarified as relevant papers (at least 2 to my knowledge) are not covered.

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

This systematic review covers studies from European countries as well as Northern America.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Quality of generalization and summary

Q 14 Significance to the field

Q 15 Interest to a general audience

Q 16 Quality of the writing

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.