

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Subgroup behaviors and factors influencing compliance with COVID-19 preventive measures among undergraduate students in Southern Thailand

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Kanokwan Tharawan

Submitted on: 02 May 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606788

### EVALUATION

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

This is a quantitative study of approximately 600 undergraduate students aged between 18–21 years old who studied at Prince of Songkla University, Thailand. The researcher would like study whether the students were compliant to safety measures against COVID-19 and the characteristics of the students with high compliance. The study was however conducted in mid 2022, which was after the pandemic.

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

The conceptual framework was acceptable, yet it was neither interesting nor significant.

#### 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.

Besides the fact that this study is neither interesting nor significant, my only concern is this study is out of date.

### PLEASE COMMENT

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

The title is appropriate and concise, but not attractive. I am not sure, however, if the title can be made any more attractive. There is genuinely nothing more to present than what is already presented in the current title.

#### Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes.

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

The English writing is acceptable although the author should proofread a few more times. There are a few mistakes.

#### 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:

Accept.