

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on The impact of COVID-19 on mental health care utilization in Switzerland was strongest among young females – retrospective study in 2018–2020

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Uy Hoang

Submitted on: 20 Feb 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605839

### EVALUATION

#### Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

total psychiatric inpatient admissions were decreased by 16.2% (95% CI -19.2% – -13.2%) in the first pandemic shutdown and decreased by 3.9% (95% CI -6.7% – -0.2%) in the second shutdown.

Total outpatient psychiatric consultation incidence of the was not significantly affected. There was a shift in the modality of these consultations during the first shutdown, with in-person consultations decreasing by 22.4% (95% CI -26.3% – 18.5%) and teleconsultations increasing by 255.4% (95% CI 226.0% – 281.8%).

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

strength – nationwide dataset for inpatient admissions, 15% of outpatient data, long period of follow-up  
limitations – not clear how representative outpatient data is (how many patients treated privately?), no data on impact of subsequent waves of COVID variants from Dec 2020.

#### 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.

##### Major comments

– unclear why the authors have limited their analysis to Dec 2020, given that it is now 2023, it would interesting to see if there trends continued in to 2021–22.

##### Minor

– the trend in rapid uptake of teleconsultations appears to mirror findings from elsewhere (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35534063/>), however it is difficult to tell if this is a function of the outpatient dataset used as it is not clear how representative this 15% of the outpatient consultations is.

### 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?

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.

Reference 24 appears to be faulty

#### 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.