PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 76802

Title: Mental Health during the Covid-19 Pandemic in the Population of the Slovak Republic: Cross-Sectional Survey Study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06208740

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Full Professor, Nurse

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Portugal

Author's Country/Territory: Slovakia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-01 10:02

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-05 11:30

Review time: 4 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The research is strongly grounded in the empirical literature and theory and the methods rely heavily upon established measures. This topic is really interesting and helpful during this pandemic period, and will be helpful even after the pandemic is finished. Still, some areas need clarification as noted below: - Indicate the study's design in the title. - The literature addressed is not described accurately so far as I can see. Relevant literature should be presented more deeply in order to support the research problem. Further, there is no clear distinction between manuscript sections in terms of the content they report. First, I suggest dividing the section "Introduction" into three components, respectively introduction (explain the general argument of the paper, without going into specific details) background (situate the study concepts within the context of extant knowledge, discuss the international relevance of the concepts) and purpose, creating greater clarity in the analysis of the reader. What is the study's biggest contribution? The contribution should be clearly stated in the introduction. - This investigation needs an additional subheading about the theoretical framework used. It is not clear how the theoretical framework guided this study.   - The authors claim to be the first study in Slovakia, but there are several studies available, even in student populations: Rutkowska, A.; Liska, D.; Cie´slik, B.; Wrzeciono, A.; Brod'áni, J.; Barcalová, M.; Gurín, D.; Rutkowski, S. Stress Levels and Mental Well-Being among Slovak Students during e-Learning in the COVID-19 Pandemic. Healthcare 2021, 9, 1356. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9101356 Hajduk, M., Dancik, D., Januska, J., Strakova, A., Turcek, M., Heretik, A., & Pecenak, J. (2022). Depression and anxiety among College Students in Slovakia - Comparison of the Year 2018 and during

COVID-19 pandemic. Bratislavske lekarske listy, 123(1), 44–49. https://doi.org/10.4149/BLL_2022_007 Gavurova, B., Ivankova, V., Rigelsky, M., Mudarri, T., & Miovsky, M. (2022). Somatic Symptoms, Anxiety, and Depression Among College Students in the Czech Republic and Slovakia: A Cross-Sectional Study. Frontiers in public health, 10, 859107. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.859107 Methods - Please report the use of Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) checklist. - The ethical aspects in collecting data are not specifically clarified, independently of the voluntary nature of the subjects´ participation, variables such as the approval by the local IRB, the offer of incentives to participate (how participants were recruited and whether they were compensated for participation), sharing and use of data and informed consent are not patent. - More precision is necessary regarding the sampling strategy and access to the target population. Response rate? How were participants recruited? Were inclusion/exclusion criteria used? - What were the expected effect sizes? There is no mention of the sample size that was targeted and obtained to meet the sample size requirements for data analysis. This information should be provided. - Have the applied instruments been validated for the Slovak population? Or were they applied in English? References to the authors of the instruments and respective validations should be placed. The presentation of certain metric properties in relation to reliability and validity is justified. - How can you prevent fraudulent activity in online survey platforms? - Did you analyze any potential non-response bias? And early vs late bias? - Did you check if data can suffer from common method bias? Results - A better visual structure of tables (boldface variables with statistical significance) would improve the readability. - In the discussion section, there is a complete absence of the empirical implications of the study, besides which the theoretical implications should have been approached in greater depth; Also implications for nursing practice and research need addressed in more deep. I suggest

dividing this theoretical implications/ recommendations for action, in three ways: - individual actions; - employer responsibilities; and policy implications. - How for the findings of the present study are generalized across the Europe? CHECKLIST FOR STYLE - The manuscript will serve a broad audience of students, researchers, and practitioners, however the manuscript needs to be carefully and attentively proofread, because some sentences are awkwardly constructed, punctuation is deficient, and therefore reading is occasionally difficult to follow. Would recommend a thorough technical edit of this paper.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 76802

Title: Mental Health during the Covid-19 Pandemic in the Population of the Slovak Republic: Cross-Sectional Survey Study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03839697

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Slovakia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-01 17:29

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-10 16:25

Review time: 8 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[　] Grade A: Excellent　[　] Grade B: Very good　[Y] Grade C: Good [　] Grade D: Fair　[　] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[　] Grade A: Priority publishing　[　] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[　] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[　] Accept (High priority)　[　] Accept (General priority) [　] Minor revision　[　] Major revision　[Y] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes　[　] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Many congratulations for this piece of work.   However, I am sorry to say that results drawn are well expected and well known. The paper does not add much to the existing literature.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title, abstract, and keywords are okay, with just minor revision I give for the abstract part. Background of the study is given. Suggestions for the methods, the exclusion/inclusion criteria can be added and there are several inconsistencies. The results should include the distribution of prevalence and severity of anxiety and depression for age groups. For example, age 15-25 no anxiety 55% mild anxiety 25% an so on (based on GAD-7 and PHQ-9 classifications). The discussion part comparing the findings with prevalence from other studies can be made more concise and summarized so the reader can get the important points that want to be stated. Some parts need more reference/citation and added explanation for the findings. The tables and figure is adequate and quite clear, however I have some questions that I already addressed in the file. Suggestions for further studies are not yet given. Some language corrections are necessary. In general, the writing does what it aimed for, it is good, beneficial for improvement of knowledge, practice, and policy for better mental health in Slovakia. Limitation of the study is already given. References already given are relevant and quite up to date.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I believe that the review carried out has greatly improved the quality of the study. Also, I do think that the author(s) addresses the broad questions, appropriately which were asked.