

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Measuring resilience and fatality rate during the first wave of COVID-19 pandemic in Northern Italy: a note

Policy Brief, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Avaneesh Singh

Submitted on: 01 Feb 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2022.1604308

### EVALUATION

#### Q 1 What are the main findings and conclusions reported in this manuscript?

Comparing data obtained with different 19 approaches based on statistical inference and large-scale serological survey, the paper 20 highlights, that great care must be taken when using case-fatality and crude mortality data, 21 which in the absence of careful analysis, can lead to erroneous conclusions on the 22 assessment of the resilience between healthcare systems.

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

Min advantage is the using the crude case-fatality rate in pandemic gives us no sounding 24 information about the real capability of healthcare systems to save lives during the 25 pandemic.

#### Q 3 Are there objective errors or fundamental flaws? If yes, please detail your concerns.

No

#### Q 4 Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Does the manuscript provide an appropriate context for a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Does the manuscript use language that can be understood by a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Is the quality of figures and/or tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Is the evidence presented appropriate, sound and objective?

Yes.

Are the action points provided based on the evidence?

No.

Are the action points provided reasonable and feasible?

Yes.

Are there any ethical issues with the recommendations provided?

No.

**Q 5** Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

Some modification needed, please include the below comments:

1. Show analysis base briefly. It is not very clear.
2. How you Estimated infection rate, estimated infected population, and Estimated infection fatality rate, explain mathematical terms.
3. Include some computation experiment with analysis.

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

<b>Q 6</b> Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 7</b> Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 8</b> Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 9</b> Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 10</b> Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 11</b> Overall quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### REVISION LEVEL

**Q 12** Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.