

Thank you for offering an opportunity to review a manuscript that investigated the compound impact of COVID-19 and flood on the mental health of a flood-prone area in Vietnam. The manuscript is well-written and structured, with methodological integrity. However, there are some queries the authors need to address.

Introduction

1. In page 2, line 55, the statement ‘while the flood and under-evaluated’ and the following references are misleading, as the authors cited a paper prior to the COVID-19. It would be a good choice if the authors cite Ogunbode et al. (2019) after ‘*While the flood impacts on mental health are considerable and long-lasting.*’

Otherwise, the *Introduction* section is well-written, documenting relevant articles in both global and regional contexts.

Methodology

2. The authors clearly documented the simultaneous occurrence of floods and COVID-19 in the selected study areas. They specifically mentioned using the K6 scale to measure distress among the residents of Hue City. Importantly, the K6 scale is designed to assess an individual's mental health, specifically measuring distress experienced over the past 30 days (see Kessler, R. C., Barker, P. R., Colpe, L. J., Epstein, J. F., Gfroerer, J. C., Hiripi, E., . . . Zaslavsky, A. M. (2003). Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 60(2), 184–189. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.60.2.184). The authors examined the mental health of residents in Hue City concerning incidents that occurred over two years ago. This raises a question about how they addressed the potential recall bias among participants and whether they considered individuals who may have relocated to study areas after 2022 from other parts of the country. Additionally, the authors did not specify any inclusion or exclusion criteria for the population studied.
3. The authors stated they interviewed 400 household heads using systematic random sampling from two communes; however, it is unclear if this sample size adequately represents the study areas.
4. The authors are requested to mention the reliability of K6 in their study.
5. The authors are requested to provide any relevant articles that support merging 'moderate' and 'severe' distress into the 'Yes' category. If they choose not to merge 'no' and 'moderate' distress into the 'no or moderate' distress category, they must provide an explanation for this decision.

The authors are requested to address or clarify the aforementioned issues in the methodology.