

Review of: "A brief overview on COVID-19 and its comparison with SARS, MERS, and H1N1"

Giovanni C Actis¹, Davide G Ribaldone¹

¹ University Hospital in Turin

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

SARS-CoV-2 Viral Infections: Three Years On and an Over-Revving Engine

Giovanni C Actis, MD - Brief Comments and Opinion Statement

Davide G Ribaldone, MD, PhD

Turin University, Core Hospitals, Turin Territory; Gastroenterology and Teaching Hospitals

Abstract

Approximately three years ago, we were unexpectedly visited by a novel coronavirus. Almost unknown to the mass information organizations, at the turn of the third year, the ID card of SARS-CoV-2 highlights an infection tribute approaching 767 million, as gathered from the table below focusing on the COVID figures. Swinging disease figures of incidence, confusing yet appalling reports about the long-term prognosis (Long Covid) tightly mixed with neurologic complications, uninterrupted breaking in of specifically infectious variants, all contribute to boosting, rather than restraining, the Corona disease impact.

Cases in the Last 30 Days: 1,492,194

Fatalities in the Last 30 Days: 3,276

Daily Fatality Rate: 109

Comprehensive Disease Cases: Approximately 767 million

Compiling this minireview, Saeed Reza and Hormozi Jing^[1], were probably bearing in mind the commendable project to provide an easy-to-check booklet relevant to the basic/clinical issues that, despite at least a three-year time lag, continue to perturb the air around COVID and its mutated companions. In this activity, they intercepted the route of the SARS-CoV-2, nowadays universally known as the unique causal agent of the variegated COVID syndromes. Indeed, they found that their way had been made "rocky" owing to the astonishing wealth of knowledge accumulated in three years of febrile world-scaled struggle on the "Coronas" footprints. Wandering amidst those variegated news swarms, we precociously

appreciated the growing gap between concrete "grayish" achievements and hopeful "blue" horizons. Rather than burning energies in rewriting what had already become solid tenets from seasoned rambles, perhaps young/energized angry investigators could extract the best from their older predecessors, willing to combine the calm stepping on of the older with the bravery of the younger [2][3].

[2][3] At this point, we are glad to consider a few points that were incorporated from suggestions outside our research group. Alerted by these inputs, we opted not to favor a new article format to include the relevant changes but to envisage a kind of re-review of the existing basis. We are thus proposing to "edit" the basic ideas that formed the initial paper's scaffold. We emphasize that only at a superficial glance can rewriting a brand new article look most demanding. In fact, free critical reviewing might prove a similarly hard task.

With enormously targeted topics such as the SARS epidemics, competition for paper space has become a titanic combat, an arena now off-limits for "common people." Yet, the challenge emphasized by this article has favored a novel observation: true advances can only be traced to unchanged men's acts and thoughts in History and can be perceived by studying the documented past, not the uncertain future. (4,5)

Instead of wasting excessive energy in re-writing what already pertains to consolidated areas of basic/clinical science (something similar to the result presented in [1]), now a significant part of the endeavor might be destined to the student fraction that manifests a clearly discernible interest for those study areas which, in spite of showing promise to begin with, lost their attraction with time. Witnessing a neat loss of human resources, as it is understandable to leave the sinking ship behind, the gap between course down-sizing and course closure may progressively narrow.

I would like to try and explain a few concepts that I placed above, yet in a form largely worth being improved:

1. Topics like the material treated in [1] do leave little room for those writers waiting elsewhere in the line.
2. Facing such topics may turn out, all-in-all, mostly comfortable to the Author and mostly attractive to the Reader if a narrative emphasis is placed on the characters of Mankind, rather than on Nature or the Environment.
3. Looking back and considering what our siblings have done in History appear to better pay off than gazing into the obscure void ahead of us, which, ironically enough, is probably waiting for us to try and fill the ditch [4]

Thus, I'd say that no conventional point can be raised against this paper. I would accept the observation that unconventional discussion may catch people relatively unprepared, but it may be the way for a referee to really be helpful.

The proposed rating for this modified article is now: 4

References

1. a, b, c Jangi, S. R. H. (2023). *A brief overview on COVID-19 and its comparison with SARS, MERS, and H1N1*. Qeios. <https://doi.org/10.32388/SP6YSU>
2. a, b Patrucco, F., Gavelli, F., Fagonee, S., Solidoro, P., Undas, A., & Pellicano, R. (2021). *Current treatment*

challenges in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Polish Archives of Internal Medicine*, 131(9), 854-861. <https://doi.org/10.20452/pamw.16077>

3. ^{a, b}Liu, Q., Qin, C., Liu, M., & Liu, J. (2021). Effectiveness and safety of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in real-world studies: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Infectious Diseases of Poverty*, 10(1), 132. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-021-00915-3>
4. [^]Sánchez-Ron, J. M. (2010, February). Rebuilding the heart in Darwin's year: Stem cell therapies in a Darwinian context. *Journal of Cardiovascular Translational Research*, 3(1), 8-12. doi:10.1007/s12265-009-9152-3