

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental and occupational health of the migrant population living in settlements in the province of Huelva (Spain)

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Dewi Susanna

Submitted on: 01 Apr 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604628

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The findings are not clear yet, since the statement in the conclusion especially paragraph-1 is not the finding of this research. The authors have to see back at the result of the data analysis.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This topic is unique since it talks about the migrants in Spain; it is limited to studies related to migrants and COVID-19. Some of the data are not displayed yet, since the tables did not contain any information as written in the text. The authors have to show the results of the data analysis in the results section. It may make it easier for the readers understand.

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.

Introduction:

- The title is about mental health and occupational health. Does mental health mean anxiety and fear?
- The study was about the anxiety and fear of COVID as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, but it is very little information about COVID-19
- The characteristics of the province should be described briefly to give an image to readers of what it is like.
- The COVID-19 suffered was only 3.1%. It is important? Does it have a big impact? Does it become a problem? It must be described briefly in the introduction to rise the problem statement.

Methods:

- The data management should be described briefly to make it understandable to readers. There are so many items observed. How did they manage before doing the analysis?
- SPSS used for analysis. It should be mentioned the license they have.

Results:

- There are so many descriptions that are not found in the table: please see lines 161 to 186 (except lines 165-166) (Table 2). 3
- How did calculate 'the mean' in Table 3. What is the meaning of 'mean' in this Table 3? Is it an average of a variable?
- Each number mentioned in the text must be found in the table. For instance, we could not find the following numbers in any tables: $FF=2.3$ $p=0.045$; $t=2.2$ $p=0.01$; $t=249$ $p=0.01$ $F=3.61$ $p=0.01$; $t=2.17$ $p=0.03$, $t=4.2$ $p=0.001$; $r=0.27$, $p=-0.20$; $p=-0.41$ and soon. The author must show this information in the table as the results of data analysis, otherwise, all description is nothing. For this case, a major revision is needed.

Discussion:

The author must take a look at the result to find the main findings and discuss them using the proper references to make them more comprehensive. Do not forget to include the decision-makers on how to handle this problem found.

Conclusion

After the authors take a look at the main findings, they formulate the conclusion statement. Any advice to the decision-makers might be a last part of this section.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 → Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

I think the title does not match the content. We can see the last analysis (table 4), it looks like the authors want to analyze the three methods (AMICO, UWES, and GHQ012) for the same variables. It is not about mental health and occupational health as mentioned in the title.

Q 5 → Are the keywords appropriate?

The keywords are not appropriate and too many; the maximum of keywords is usually up to six words only.

Q 6 → Is the English language of sufficient quality?

The authors suggested consulting the English Editing and Proofreading Services. It is not only to make the English fluently go through the concept of this research but also how to construct sentences for each paragraph.

Q 7 → Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Q 8 → Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes, the references are adequately relevant, but for discussion, it is still more references to make the discussion more comprehensive and focuses only on the findings.

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.

