

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Exposure to Adverse Events and Later Life Cognitive, Mental, and Physical Health

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Submitted on: 13 Mar 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606499

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Utilizing two waves of data from longitudinal survey HAALSI (South Afrika) authors explore the association of various adversities with decline (3 year follow up) in cognitive (memory, orientation), mental (CES-D depression) and physical (activities of daily living) health of female (n=1993) and male (n=1496) in age of 40 years and more. They found that many of adverse childhood and lifetime experiences and exposures were associated with an improvement in health, while others with decline in health.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Study is based on longitudinal data, robust dataset and methodology. Description of methods, results as well as tables are clear. Discussion might benefit from shortening repetitive parts describing findings. Introduction needs a major revision as it is quite chaotic and repetitive.

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.

Introduction consist of introduction, background (?), setting and hypothes (?).
I strongly recommend to avoid subheadings and restructured it, e.g. merge introduction and background (bacground is much closer to what is expected in Introduction and introduction sounds rather like justification of aim what I would expect in a shorter version at the end of introduction).
Setting and hypothes - first para is something what I would expect in methods or in a shorter version as a part of justification at the end of Introduction.
Second para (row 79-88) seems to be attempt to formulate aim and hypothesis, but it is so confusing and wordy, that I strongly recomend to revise it, be more explicit with regard to aim and if you find it important follow it with hypothesis.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

No. It is too general and not connected to the aim and the message of the study.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

No. I recommend to test it by search in database.
Cognitive function, depression, activities of daily living, adverse experiences, middle age, South Africa

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

No answer given.

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?)

Need to be checked and corrected. e.g. ref 14

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.