

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Conservation of Resources, Psychological Distress and Resilience during the Covid-19 pandemic

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Ricardo Rafael

Submitted on: 07 Jan 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604567

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study examined the association between stress, loneliness, concern, COVID-19-related post traumatic symptoms (PTS), resilience factors and Conservation of Resources via an online survey among 2000 adults. Loss of resources, stress, loneliness and worry were considered risk factors for suffering and PTS, while resilience played a protective role. The study was well conducted and presented important results for science in the COVID era and potentially the post-Covid era.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The main strengths of the study were the sample size, the study design and the analytical techniques used by the authors. On the other hand, sample size should be an online recruitment method, which is a limiting factor in producing selection bias. Although the authors declare this study limitation, it is only necessary that it be better explained and discussed how this potential selection bias may have affected the production of data and how it should be interpreted by readers.

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.

- 1) The title is not clear enough. It does not spell out the central object of the manuscript's discussion. On first reading I was in doubt about what resources the authors were dealing with. My suggestion is that the authors carry out an exercise in constructing the title depending on the objective of the study. Eg.: Conservation of Resources, Psychological Distress and Resilience Related in the Covid-19 era
- 2) The introduction written in topics didn't seem like the best strategy either. I think that an introduction should provide the necessary elements for understanding the object of study. It must be instigating and problematizing, having as one of the objectives to conquer potential readers and support them with theoretical elements necessary for understanding the text. I suggest the authors review the form.
- 3) The methodology is well written and brings the elements for understanding the analysis. However, in order to add value to the text, I suggest that the authors base themselves on the guideline "Improving the quality of Web surveys: the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES)" [Eysenbach G. Improving the quality of Web surveys: the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES). J Med Internet Res. 2004; 6(3):e34.].
- 4) I suggest that the limitations (especially the potential selection bias) be better spelled out and discussed in light of similar studies during the Covid era.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

No. My suggestion is that the authors carry out an exercise in constructing the title depending on the objective of the study. Eg.: Conservation of Resources, Psychological Distress and Resilience Related in the Covid-19 era

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

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?)

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:

Minor revisions.