Peer Review Report

Review Report on Acceptance of public health measures during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study of the Swiss population's beliefs, attitudes, trust, and information-seeking behavior

EVALUATION

Q 1   Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study brings interesting data from a survey of 2.5K+ respondents from Switzerland targetting Covid19 related
(i) Information-seeking behaviour; (ii) attitudes and beliefs; (iii) trust. Results stress the enduring importance of conventional information channels (TV / Newspapers) , confirm high trust in HCPs and Scientists and suggest a stable level of trust in science and moderate decline for health institutions.

Q 2   Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The strengths of the study include : a large sample, results that confirm observed trends both in relation to Covid19 and other areas.
The limitations of the paper include:
– A superficial literature review despite the existence of a rich corpus on perception, behaviour and trust
– Insufficient information about how trust is deduced from the criteria assigned
– The relationship between the results and the risk communication advice that is given. The authors should link to science on science communication (starting with Fischhoff 2012).
– Lacks of attractive figures

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.

On the whole this paper offers potential for a good publication. The strengths of the study include in particular : a large sample that is throrougly surveyed, as well as results that confirm previously observed trends both in relation to Covid19 and other areas of health. The paper, however, also has room for improvement:
– The literature review is relatively superficial, despite the existence of a rich corpus on health perception, trust and communication. I suggest to beef up this section.
– Insufficient information about how trust is deduced from the criteria assigned. The reader would benefit from more clarity on the relation between the criteria, questions and known factors that build/undermine trust . Authors should not fail to notice that trust is a contested area of research therefore it is really important to better demonstrate the strength of methods.
– The relationship between the results and the risk communication advice also needs to be clarified. This could be done using at the literature on science communication (starting with Fischhoff 2012).

I would also advice the authors to address issues about age biais in the sample especially when looking into specific sources of information. Finally some attractive figures would certainly help to enhance the impact of the paper.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4   Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

I found the title slightly misleading as the research seems to be primarily about studying patterns of consumption and their impact on trust. Maybe the authors may reconsider.

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?)

The literature review is far too limited. I suggest a much more in-depth review (substantial revision) to systematically account for the relevant science on:
– Perception /behaviour
– Trust
– Health Communication

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.