

# Review of: "Interventions to increase personal protective behaviours to limit the spread of respiratory viruses: A rapid evidence review and meta-analysis"

Diego Casado-Mansilla<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de Deusto

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

This piece of research reviews the existing body of knowledge on behavioural interventions to slow down the expansion of respiratory diseases. The authors found that interventions that facilitate the adoption of hand hygiene actions and face-mask usage are more salient and widespread in prior studies than other interventions aiming at disinfecting surfaces or maintaining the physical distance (to cite some). Furthermore, the former interventions are not only more popular, but the results reported are, in general, positive to limit the spread of the virus.

The article addresses a very relevant topic, limiting the spread of respiratory viruses, for policymakers and behaviour scientists overall because of the increasing trend to make these two groups work together for creating new, and better, public policies informed by scientific evidence.

Although the article is sound and timely, it also comes with some caveats because of the limiting timing to perform the meta-analysis and the rapid methodology employed to gather the existing evidence. Nevertheless, the limitations have been well addressed by the authors. I fully understand that the evidence is scarce, however, my personal feeling is that the results from the meta-analysis would have been better if the target population had been limited accordingly (for example, only kids, only mid-low income population, only trials with more than one week of prevalence, only self-reports with validated instruments, etc.).

Some minor remarks: I encourage you to revisit and rethink the results section as the reader can easily lose the thread with all these percentages.

When it comes to providing results of APEASE metric, it would be interesting for the reviewer to understand which mechanisms were used to elaborate on these metrics.

It is unclear what the role of stakeholders have in the article. I understand that they were interviewed and that some inputs were gathered from them. However, their feedback seems to not be reflected in the final results to weighting, for instance, the results obtained.

I would like to have seen more clearly if the effectiveness of the intervention was measured objectively or subjectively giving more weight to the former. Also, some recommendations in the best methods to measure the "change" would be appreciated to draw over your work.

To sum up, I applaud the researchers for the idea of carrying this research out at this moment where the scientific evidence is very important to make informed (and slow) decisions. Congratulations.

