

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Prospective associations between social connectedness and mental health. Evidence from a longitudinal survey and health insurance claims data.

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Lei Zhang

Submitted on: 16 Feb 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604710

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

See more details in my review and comments attached to Q3.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strength: This study's primary strength and significance was using the diagnosed mental health status rather than the respondent's reported mental health status.

Limitation: Limited (and potentially biased) samples made conclusions from this study less likely to be generalized to ordinary American adults. This imperfection of samples is the major limitation of this study. Other flaws and limitations of this draft discussed in my major and minor concerns (see the attached PDF file to Q3) can be addressed and improved.

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 include my detailed review and comments in the attached PDF file below.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes. See more details in my review and comments attached to Q3.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes. See more details in my review and comments attached to Q3.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes. See more details in my review and comments attached to Q3.

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. See more details in my review and comments attached to Q3.

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.