

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Insights on late-stage COVID-19 pandemic recovery from a 21-country online survey

Original Article, Int. J. Public Health

Reviewer: Sebastian Haller

Submitted on: 12 Jul 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2025.1607601

### EVALUATION

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

A survey to collect data to inform about effective recovery strategies was conducted via Facebook in 21 countries. The findings display disparities in domains as life satisfaction, food security, health care access, and vaccine confidence and trust.

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

**Strengths:** Sampling frame and sampling well explained. This approach allows to get timely, comparable results for many populations with a rather large sample. The article is overall well written.

**Limitations:** Response in age strata as low as 8.6% in an online platform, which is used by a biased sample in most countries. The Authors have used weighting procedures that address the non-response – but with the underlying assumption that the answers within survey age groups represent the answers the population in that age group would have given. But, that using Facebook may select a biased sample can not be addressed with the methods – result is a high uncertainty and underrepresented deprived and hard to reach populations. This should be made clear in the limitations.

Conclusions do not fully derive from study results.

#### **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:** 1) The study objective: A cross-sectional survey for comprehensive understanding of the societal impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic? In my opinion, this approach allows for generating hypothesis and assumptions. E.g. a cohort study or at least a survey at 2 points in time may allow to answer. 2) Exposure: The exposures are not well enough defined. Was the individual exposure to COVID addressed in the survey, or the exposure to the pandemic overall? The vaccination programs and vaccines available varied strongly across the countries, the public health measures too. I am uncertain, if we may assume a common exposure, if the authors assume such common exposure, it should be better characterized. 3) Has the analysis for patterns and country similarities been conducted with an age-standardised population? If we assume that age and gender may influence the results, wouldn't an age-standardised analysis be preferred? 4) Neither in the study nor in the discussion section, comparisons to findings from other population-based surveys are conducted. Thus, we may not conclude from this study how valuable the approach is, only that it worked. 5) I may have missed it, but the survey questions should be made available for the reader. 6) Is this really a study about pandemic recovery? Or should it be called the status of populations in the time after the pandemic?

### PLEASE COMMENT

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

Likely better: Insights on pandemic recovery from an online survey among 21 countries

**Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

No answer given.

**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?)

No answer given.

#### 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.