

# Review of: "Viewpoint: Strategic Insights and a Scoping Review of Telehealth Platforms and SWOT Analysis of Amazon's Clinical Endeavors"

Arindam Basu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Canterbury

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- The search terms are not properly formatted; they needed a clear description of what databases were searched, where such terms were expected to be found (title/text word/abstract, subject headings), which databases were searched, and exactly what restrictions in terms of date ranges were expected, and what the rationale was for searching for these dates.
- Surge for virtual health care was not in the “aftermath” of the COVID-19 pandemic; it peaked DURING the COVID-19 pandemic.
- "Recent nationwide launch", which 'nation'?
- No rationale or study question is provided in the introduction section. Why are they doing this study, or what do they want to study?
- What was the PICO (patient or population, intervention, comparator, and outcomes) related question?
- In the absence of a proper question, a review is not likely to yield correct search results.
- What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and why?
- Rayyan is a non-standard systematic review AI package; the use of it is not acceptable for academically serious reviews. This is best avoided or triangulated with other packages.
- Whether AI-powered patient intake is a strength is open to question, and it is not clear why the authors claim that using AI, patients will expect “a more intuitive” intake. Without explaining the algorithms that the AI uses, a discussion about the strengths of AI is premature. The authors need to discuss this.
- Lack of paediatric population is not a weakness; it is a limitation.