

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Protective factors of nurses' mental health and professional well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic: a multicenter longitudinal study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Slađana Režić

Submitted on: 26 May 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607449

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

In the study, emphasis was placed on protective factors that can relieve stress and improve the quality of life and work of nurses. The results can be used in strategies to improve the working environment of nurses.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

A limitation of the study is the non-uniformity of the collection of respondents, which made certain statistical analyzes impossible. The authors used the R program, which is an excellent choice for the analysis of such data. Also, the use of a longitudinal random-intercept regression model enabled obtaining useful and important data in this research.

The main strengths of this study are the longitudinal design that included several countries.

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.

No answer given.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, the title is appropriate.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes, the title is appropriate.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, the English language is sufficient quality.

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 references cover relevant literature.
Please provide the doi if the article has one.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11 Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 12 Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.