

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Critical health literacy in a pandemic: a cluster analysis among German university students

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Nina Schnyder

Submitted on: 14 Jun 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2021.1604210

EVALUATION

Q 1 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.

See attachment

Q 2 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The authors analysed the distribution of "critical health literacy during a pandemic" (CHL-P), a new concept but not dissimilar to "health literacy", in a student sample. They found that one-third of students clustered in the high CHL-P group. However, from a statistical point of view, it is somewhat unclear how the authors have arrived at this conclusion.

Q 3 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strength and limitation: large sample size but unclear how representative the sample is for a general student population.

Limitation: none of the used measures were validated.

Strength and limitation: CHL-P seems to be an important concept for public health. However, it is unclear what its advantages are over traditional "health literacy".

Potential limitation regarding the statistical methods that have been used: it is questionable whether the used statistical tests are appropriate.

Limitation: a response rate has neither been reported (results) nor commented (discussion).

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?

As much as I can judge as a non-native English speaker myself: 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?)

This is difficult to answer with the currents surge of new literature appearing every day.

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 take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.