

Review of: "Could governmental interventions improve subjective well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic? Findings from 750 street vendors in Cali, Colombia"

Suladda Pongutta

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This study should contribute to the knowledge that inform relevant governmental interventions. However, this study needs improvements as follows.

1. The study objective should be specific to street vendors. The arguments given by the author why she/he thinks 750 street vendors could represent the whole society were not convincing enough from the statistics and social demography perspectives.
2. The introduction of this study focuses mainly on economic impacts of COVID19, background information of Columbia, street vendors in Columbia and why their well-being could reflect well-being of the whole society (but with little scientific evidence to support this assumption). I would suggest the author to provide insights into governmental interventions provided to street vendors in Columbia (e.g., what are they, are they ad hoc/short-term/long-term interventions, and when were they given to the street vendors? so that we can foresee the potentials) and why she/he thinks this would help improve the street vendors' subjective well-being (e.g., evidence showing the relationship between financial aids and mental health or economic hardship during COVID19 (or economic impacts of COVID19) and mental health in other populations).
3. This study used convenience sampling method and provided detailed information how the participants were sampled, which is helpful in the eyes of readers. However, sample size calculation method should be described too.
4. Biases (e.g., social desirability bias, recall bias) can occur with self-report assessments. The author should describe their views and what they did to reduce the bias in the methods or discussion.
5. Outcome measurement methods should be cited. Are they standard methods? References should be provided. Also, reasons why these outcome indicators were used should be provided.
6. Are there any scientific justifications explaining why the Likert-type scale outcomes were categorised into "yes" or "no" and why median was used as the cutoff point? This is important since mistreatment of the scores could introduce bias.
7. Descriptive statistics should be presented in tables to make it easier to follow.
8. Why was the relationship between time use and business performance included in the results. This section can be removed or included in the supplements.
9. The conclusions should answer the study objectives.
10. More thoughts should be provided in the key explanations of the main findings to guide the application of the findings.

I would suggest the author to follow standard patterns of discussion.