

Peer Review Report

Review Report on How working conditions, socioeconomic insecurity and health behaviors mediate the association between working poverty and health in Germany.

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Sakari Karvonen

Submitted on: 04 Jan 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604555

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study shows that those who have difficulties in making their ends meet with their wages ("the working poor") have poorer mental and physical health. It also suggests that this association is mediated mostly by the strain created by worrying about how to make the ends meet. The mediation effect differs between genders and between mental and physical health.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

A major limitation is that the difference in health between those with financial difficulties and those who do not experience such difficulties appears quite small (0.4 for men in mental health, for example) in these data. So initially there seems to be relatively little to explain. Whether this is due to the nature of the data or for some other reason is not considered, but on this basis the whole point of the study needs better justification. Another limitation is that the key finding – that poverty results into financial worries that affect health status – does not appear a significant contribution. Strengths of the study include high quality data allowing a quasi-causal setting. Also the methodological approach seems novel.

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.

Please see the attached file.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, but I suggest another refocusing the ms.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

As for the current ms., yes they are.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

I am not native, but to me there appeared to be small errors even though mostly the text written is of high quality.

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

☒☒☐☐☐

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.