Peer Review Report

Review Report on Long COVID through a public health lens: An Umbrella Review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Christine A'Court
Submitted on: 07 Nov 2021
Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2022.1604501

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main theme of the review.**

This review sought to describe available evidence on the prevalence, nature and socio-economic impact of 'long Covid' (accepting a range of definitions of the condition) and to systematically assess the quality of the evidence using largely pre-defined and well recognised methodology.

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

The limitations of the review are those of the studies-namely heterogeneity of populations studied, modes of diagnosis, timing of evaluation relative to onset of infection; also the limited comparisons with pre-morbid state, non universal inclusion of controls, and often commonly encountered risk of bias. The strengths are the systematic, transparent and considered way in which the authors deal with these limitations.

Q 3 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.**

Major
Excellent pragmatic concise evaluation of truly challenging area.
Minor
The authors did not attempt to take the discussion beyond the data, perhaps wisely, leaving the question of whether the condition exists over and above the relatively well recognised entities of post ITU syndrome and post-viral fatigue/syndrome. They allude to the need for further research. I would like to see them lay out what a study would look like that answered at least some of the currently unanswerable questions. They did not discuss any of the evidence surrounding association with, and lack of association with demonstrable organ impairment. This may due to word count restriction but I think that for readers unfamiliar with the field they should ideally, at least touch on this equally murky area.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?**

Yes, at least to my knowledge

Q 5 **Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)**

Yes.

Q 6 **Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner**

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes, although the sparsity of studies in developing countries is stark

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Quality of generalization and summary

Q 14 Significance to the field

Q 15 Interest to a general audience

Q 16 Quality of the writing

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.