

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Socioeconomic status and adherence to preventive measures during the COVID-19 pandemic in Switzerland: a population based digital cohort analysis

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Salvatore Panico

Submitted on: 11 Feb 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606861

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The aim of this study is to assess the association between socioeconomic status (SES) and adherence to preventive measures in Switzerland along the period of high incidence and that of low incidence COVID-19 pandemic, using data from the CI-DFU eCohort, a part of a nationwide seroprevalence study coordinated by the Swiss School of Public Health (SSPH+).

Analysing two main indicators of SES (EDI and education), they found no evidence for both indicators in adherence to preventive measures when considering the whole sample throughout the entire follow up period. The detected trend indicated that individuals with higher EDI or education tended to adhere less to preventive measures than those with lower values of the indicators.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The main limitations of the study are well reported by the authors:

a) possible selection bias in the responders to the questionnaires administered to the cohort; b) self-assessment of the adherence to preventive measures.

The main strengths are the very large number of observations and the reasonably satisfying response rate to the questions over time. In the balance between limitations and strength the findings are likely to be close to truth, The explanations provided by the author appear to be reasonable.

Overall the analyses of the data are appropriate.

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.

Major comments. These refer to the limitations of the observation largely recognized by the authors: a) possible selection bias in the responders to the questionnaires administered to the cohort; b) self-assessment of the adherence to preventive measures. Maybe in the conclusions these limitations should be briefly reported since they are important part of the interpretation of the study. The suggestion is to add a sentence in the conclusions.

Minor comments. It would be appreciated to report some more literature on the differences in self reporting across the SES grades in the community.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes.

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?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

The reference list is satisfying although some additional papers would be appreciated on the differences in self-reporting across the SES grades in the community.

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:

Minor revisions.