

Title: Disparate Impacts of COVID-19 in New York's Capital Region: A View from the Local Community on the Socioemotional Experience of the Pandemic

Corresponding Author: Annis Golden, Associate Professor, University at Albany

"The topic of this empirical investigation is most timely and interesting. My only small

comments are the following. First, the paper is well over the 5 page abstract limit but is in already good form as a chapter submission. On page 4 the paper references other existing surveys used to inform construction of part of the assessment procedures here but the reader does not know what these other existing surveys are. Third, at some point in the paper, terms regarding race and ethnicity are abbreviated (eg, "B/AA"). To be consistent with style manuals, these terms should continue to be spelled out, I believe. Thank you again for the privilege of reading this interesting submission!"

"In my view, the purpose of this proposed abstract was to examine the wide-ranging disparate impacts of COVID-19 on individuals living in Albany, with a particular emphasis on the Black/African American community, though others were included for comparison. This was done through a combination of survey and interview methodologies with a decently large sample from Albany. For the most part, I thought the purpose of the paper was clear, the analysis and reporting rigorous, and the findings valuable. I do have a few suggestions as the authors consider how to move forward with a full manuscript.

1. Organization. Due to the wide-ranging nature of all of the areas of life examined I found myself getting lost at times. I think it would be very helpful if you could connect the variables/constructs/demographics/etc. that you measured in your survey more concretely to the stated purposes of your study, as well as your findings, and conclusions. To some extent, you do this in the Results as you separate categories of results (e.g., economic, health), but that's not done from the beginning which makes it harder to follow. I'm wondering if you could utilize some sort of a table or figure that identifies all of the variables you focused on (and maybe even the scales/assessments used to measure these) that is then divided into these higher-order categories (e.g., health, social, emotional, economic). Then, when these categories and variables are mentioned in the results (and even discussion/implications) it won't come as a surprise or a laundry list. I get that all of these things are intertwined and I think that's important to mention, but I'm just trying to help you think through ideas of making the large amount of info. presented here more digestible.

2. Statistics reporting. I think you did a good job, overall, with the statistics reporting, but I didn't see very consistent presentation and interpretation of statistics. For example, sometimes statements were made about differences between groups without the necessary supporting statistics (although this was rare); more frequently, I found that I wasn't sure who the comparison group was (e.g., "Some B/AAs were more likely to have had both their work hours reduced while others were required to work more hours"). Because the scales weren't clearly defined I also struggled, at times, to see why some comparisons were made with chi-square and others with t-tests (e.g., concern about housing between B/AA and others was tested with a t-test; LACK of concern about housing for Hispanics vs. non-Hispanics was tested with chi square). Lastly, you use the term "highly significant" when talking about racism

differences, but that term shouldn't be used (it's either statistically significant or not based on your p-valued); instead you could report an effect size to capture the magnitude of the difference (my calculation of Cohen's d for experienced racism between B/AA and others was actually $d = 0.35$, which is moderately small).

3. Conclusions. In reference to point 1 above, because there were so many different results to parse through I wasn't sure your implications/conclusions captured everything presented (e.g., regarding economic impacts, unemployment benefits, stimulus check differences). More importantly, it'd be helpful to be reminded of what impacts demonstrated the most unique differential impact on the B/AA community compared to others given that the picture regarding COVID impacts was clearly bad, but not always worse for the B/AA community. Drawing from the categories of different impact areas might help summarize where the effects are worst and where there is the most evidence of disparate impact. Finally, the rationale behind how the recommendations were created was somewhat vague to me. Did you use the Nvivo software to help with this?

Thanks for sharing your work! I thought this was well-written, comprehensive, and important. I hope this feedback helps as you move forward."