Peer Review Report

Review Report on A cross-sectional study of the prevalence and determinants of common mental health problems in primary care in Switzerland

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Eva Rens
Submitted on: 27 Jul 2023
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606368

EVALUATION

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

GP visitors were invited to participate in a survey study. This paper describes the findings of the wellbeing of the primary care sample regarding depression and anxiety, stress and sleeping problems. I twas found that these indicators of mental disrtress are common, especially among women and younger people and lower SES. However, only 2% ever received a diagnosis, which may point to underdetection of mental health problems

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

Strength: Relevant study, The design and methodology are good

Limitation: only psychotropic treatment is investigated, while psychotherapeutic treatment is important as well, especially in mild cases (the majority of mental health problems are mild and do not require medication). Sometimes the validity of the scales are questionable (sleep disorder and stress)

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.**

All my comments are mentioned in the pdf-file.
It is an interesting and well-written paper. I have no major comments, but some things require clarification or additional reflection.

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

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.