

# Review of: "Child and adolescent self-harm in a pandemic world: Evidence from a decade of data"

Victoria Soto-Sanz<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Miguel Hernández de Elche

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I would like to thank the authors for their work. You can see that a lot of effort went into its creation. Below is some information that I hope will help to improve the manuscript. I have to say that I agree with the comments of previous reviewers. In particular, the need to specify self-harm with suicidal or non-suicidal intent, the need to add some more information to the discussion and analyses. The paper does not provide much new information, but there is room for improvement.

## Title

Need to come up with another title that is descriptive. This title does not reflect that this paper only shows prevalence data. Therefore, the word "evidence" would not be the most appropriate because it does not include related or similar variables, but data on specific rates. Furthermore, it seems that the data are from Canada, but this is not clear until you get much further into the text. It should appear in the title.

## Summary

I don't think the paper does what it says it can be used for in this abstract. The paper is informative but does not indicate predictions or go beyond reflecting the incidence of the problem during the pandemic.

The total number of participants, information on mean and standard deviation of age and location should be given.

Data should be included in the results and not merely a qualitative summary.

## Introduction

It is appropriate to use references that are reviews or meta-analyses to support your work. However, statements are made without citation.

Furthermore, different restrictions were applied in different countries during different time periods. Therefore, it is recommended to briefly explain how this was done in the country of study.

It is necessary to include definitions of self-harm without suicidal intent and self-harm with suicidal intent.

Since the introduction of a paper is the basis of the theoretical justification of the objective, it is necessary that they cover all the information they analyse. Information on rates in other countries or worldwide exists, but has not been included.

For a better understanding of the manuscript, it is recommended that they include objectives and hypotheses. In this way, in the method (statistical analysis above all) and in the result you can organise the content according to the hypotheses to facilitate understanding.

## Methods

There is no information on total number of participants and how the information on self-harm is collected or where it is taken from (hospitals, private clinics...).

If the hypotheses are included, the statistical analyses can be better explained and missing analyses can be added so that the reader knows which analyses are done to test the different hypotheses. This will be useful for the discussion section.

If the hypotheses are included, the statistical analyses can be better explained and missing ones can be added so that the reader knows which analyses are done to test the different hypotheses. This will be useful for the discussion section.

## Discussion

It would be appreciated if, when the hypotheses are available, they could be organised according to the hypotheses.

The discussion talks about there being no sex differences. However, this does not make sense because they do not justify why they study sex differences. Here you could add information about work that has found sex differences and why.

It is important that you compare the work with previous published studies.