

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

Pedro Altungy¹

¹ Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall, the paper is well prepared and deals with a really interesting topic that has not been studied in depth in these years. Governments involvement and reply to major crisis (as the COVID-19) may have a great impact on the general well-being of populations (we know that, the more support people have, the more resilient they will be to stressful situations). Thus, I consider this paper to provide useful information on this regard.

There are some aspects of the paper that I would strongly suggest to review by the authors.

First of all, the background section seemed to me to not have a real unifying thread. My subjective impression was that there appeared data about the COVID-19 worldwide, but without providing a linking argument for all of them. I would recommend to modify this.

Second, I would suggest a reviewing of the title. Reading the current title, one may have the impression that the study was run on Colombian general population. However, when reading the paper, you discover that the sample corresponded to a very specific sample (street vendors). It does not mean that, because of this, the research loses interest.

Nonetheless, accuracy is a key factor when preparing a paper, and current title could mislead readers.

Regarding the socioeconomic factors, it is said that socioeconomic strata was measured with a Likert scale from 1 to 6. However, which were the criteria for assigning participants to each strata? It would be fundamental to include that information.

For what is indicated, it seems that all questions used on the study were prepared ad hoc, not having used any validated questionnaire. It makes me wonder why no psychometrically validated questionnaire was used in the current research, at least for assessing subjective well-being. There are many validated questionnaires for this, so I think that, methodologically speaking, they should have been used. Moreover, in my opinion, the questions for assessing well-being are too much qualitative and would imply a great validity problem. In this regard, any conclusion obtained from these data would have to be taken with the utmost "care".

On the statistical analyses section it is indicated that "In a stepwise fashion of change-in-estimate criterion ($> 0.09\%$ cutoff)". Why a .09 cutoff instead of .01 or .05? Also, if we are talking about cutoffs, it is recommended to use the decimal writing instead of percentages. Then, it is indicated that odds ratios for the different variables will be calculated. However,

many of these variables are not dicotomic (a requisite for running these kind of analyses). This a big methodological problem that must be solved before publishing.

On the “Relationship between time use and business performance” section appears what seems to be regression models. However, at no point until then there had been any mention that regression analyses would be used. In addition, I would suggest to review the way these regression results are expressed (for instance, what are the bethas for each variable?).

Lastly, at the end of the results section the authors provide information about possible moderators. However, for talking about moderation effects it is necessary to run regression analyses (i.e., using Hayes (2018) method). I do not see how moderation effects can be observed with the statistical analyses used in the research. In addition, in the discussion it seems that authors are giving conclusions that are applied to the general public, when the sample has been a very specific one. Authors should be aware of this, as it would be a huge misleading conclusion (and a false one).

Overall, even though the idea for the paper is a great one and researchers achieved a good sample, I feel that the paper should be deeply reformulated before publishing.