

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Health Workforce Challenges: Key Findings from the Swiss Cohort of Healthcare Professionals & Informal Caregivers (SCOHPICA)

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Jose Mira

Submitted on: 27 Apr 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607419

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Authors analyzed intention to stay in their profession of an ample range of healthcare providers.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Authors have outlined reasonable limitations and strengths. However, practical implications are not developed. Impact of these results for future research could be also included

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.

Interesting, timely, and well-conceived study. All relevant information is included. However, the authors might consider whether the variable that appears central to their study, desire to remain in the profession, could be partly explained by some of the other variables included in the study. Additionally, it would be interesting to delve further into the point about professional migration movements, leveraging the breadth of the sample. The figures are difficult to interpret; data in tables are usually easier to understand. In the table, I believe an explanation of what "preparedness for work 1 and 2" means is needed.

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?

No.

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

Yes, It is

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.