Peer Review Report

Review Report on Health Workforce Challenges: Key Findings from the Swiss Cohort of Healthcare Professionals & Informal Caregivers (SCOHPICA)

Original Article, Int J Public Health

EVALUATION

Q 1   Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study presents findings on well-being and intention to stay in the profession among healthcare professionals in Switzerland, as well as possible determinants.

Q 2   Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The main strengths are the sample size and coverage (over 1,700 healthcare professionals, 20 different professions, diverse settings), and wide range of possible organizational, psychosocial, occupational, and sociodemographic determinants of health professionals' intentions to stay and well-being.
Regarding limitations, the use of non-probability sampling limits the representativeness of the findings. In addition, smaller sample sizes for certain professional categories may affect the ability to detect significant differences. Self-reported data.

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.

Dear Editor and Authors,
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript. The topic is highly relevant and of great interest. Below, I provide my detailed review organized by sections.
Major Comments:
Methodology and Sampling: The use of non-probability sampling is a significant limitation that could affect the representativeness of the results. However, I believe there is no other suggestion than to consider strategies to improve representativeness in future waves of data collection and to provide details on how this will be improved in future studies.
Discussion and Interpretation: Expand the discussion on the applicability of the findings to other national and international contexts. This would help in understanding the generalizability of the results.
Statistical Analysis: The analysis carried out are adequate and informative. Suggestion: If viable, it would be beneficial to include additional analyses, such as logistic regression, path analysis, and cluster analysis, to explore the relationships between various determinants and outcomes more deeply. This would enhance the overall robustness and depth of the findings.
Minor Comments:
– Revise the second paragraph of the discussion to improve clarity and conciseness.
– Revise references style, as there appears to be a minor mix of citation styles in the discussion

Revision by Sections:
Title: The title is appropriate, concise, and attractive. No changes needed.
Abstract: OK
Introduction: The introduction is well-structured and fully describes the gaps this study aims to fill.

Method: the paragraph presents a solid and well-justified description of the statistical analyses used. The methodological choices are well-founded and appropriate for the objectives of the study. It would be beneficial to include additional analyses to explore the relationships between various determinants and outcomes more deeply, though this is not necessary.

Results: The text is clear and provides specific and relevant information on the intention of HCPs to remain in their profession and on their well-being. The results are well presented, and the breakdown by professional group is useful and relevant.

Tables and figures: Tables are informative. Figures are appropriate and adequately complement the information presented in the text. They enhance the understanding of the results and allow a clear visualization of the data.

Discussion: The discussion is well structured and addresses all critical aspects necessary for a complete interpretation of the results, though second paragraph may need minor changes to improve readability. Explaining how this study's findings are relevant to other national and international contexts could be usedul.

References: I believe line 320 needs a change in references style.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I look forward to seeing the revised version.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes

Q 5   **Are the keywords appropriate?**

The keywords are relevant to the study's content.

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

Not an expert, but I found the manuscript readable.

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		4/5
Q 10	Rigor		4/5
Q 11	Significance to the field		4/5
Q 12	Interest to a general audience		3/5
Q 13	Quality of the writing		4/5
Q 14	Overall scientific quality of the study		4/5

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.