Peer Review Report

Review Report on The activity of Special Continuity Care Units in the city of Florence during the Covid-19 pandemic

Original Article, Int J Public Health

EVALUATION

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

This study aimed to evaluate the out-hospital care organization for COVID-19 patients in the city of Florence, Italy. This analysis showed a change in the pattern of assisted patients across pandemic waves. In addition, Authors showed as Male gender and the symptomatic diseaases are significant predicor of hospitalizations.

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

The strenght of this study was the collection of routinely clinical data from a particular setting developed in Italy during pandemic period. Poor studies had evaluated this kind of out-hospital care and it can improve the knowledge on this field. Despite that, this study had an important limitation: the mass vaccination campign strongly impacted ovid outcomes so Authors have to consider it and add the vaccination status in their description and in their models. Also, the use of antiviral and monoclonal antibody against sarscov2 were deeply used in Italy in the outhospital care and they strongly improved clincal outcomes, as also reported in a recent nationwide study published on Lancet (https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanepe/article/PIIS2666-7762(23)00103-5/fulltext).

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.**

I was invited to revise the paper entitled "The activity of Special Continuity Care Units in the city of Florence during the Covid-19 pandemic". It was an interesting study aimed to evaluate the activity of "Special Continuity Care Units " in the city of Florence, Italy. SCCUs is a particular setting developed in Italy during pandemic period aimed to perform out-hospital care for covid-19 patients. The topic is very interesting and this paper was one of first study that evaluated this kind of setting. Despite that, I have several observations:
- the main limitation was the lack of vaccination status. Vaccination was the most important public health intervention that impacted and improved covid-19 outcomes. So, Authors should add these information on their models;
- Also antiviral and monoclonal antibodies trongly improved clincal outcomes, as also reported in a recent nationwide study published on Lancet (https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanepe/article/PIIS2666-7762(23)00103-5/fulltext);
- Discussion section was poor and need to be improved, also comparing these results with outhospital outcomes of patients from different countries with a diffeent outhospital care model;

Minor observations:
- Statistical analysis methods should be better described: it is unclear where Authors performed Wilcoxon rank test;
- About Cox models, Authors should evaluate the assumption of proportional hazard for included variables;

– In table 5 it is unclear if models were adjusted also for other covariates. In this case, Authors should report all included covariated used in the model.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes, it is

Q 5   **Are the keywords appropriate?**

Yes, they are

Q 6   **Is the English language of sufficient quality?**

Yes, it is

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?)**

It can be improved as reported in main comments

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9   **Originality** — ▮▮▮▮▮ (5/5)

Q 10   **Rigor** — ▮▮▯▯▯ (2/5)

Q 11   **Significance to the field** — ▮▮▮▮▮ (5/5)

Q 12   **Interest to a general audience** — ▮▮▮▮▯ (4/5)

Q 13   **Quality of the writing** — ▮▮▮▯▯ (3/5)

Q 14   **Overall scientific quality of the study** — ▮▮▯▯▯ (2/5)

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15   **Please make a recommendation based on your comments:**

Major revisions.