

Review of: "Italy and SARS-CoV-2: How Did the Newly Graduates in Health Professions React? Organizational Aspects and Psychological Implications"

Paulo João Figueiredo Cabral Teles¹

¹ Universidade do Porto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Report on manuscript

"Italy and SARS-CoV-2: How Did the Newly Graduates in Health Professions React? Organizational Aspects and Psychological Implications"

by Angie Devetti *et al.*

This paper addresses the issue of assessing the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on new graduates in health professions concerning their practical training and their attitudes to patient care.

In my opinion, the quality of the paper is very low, and it does not meet the required standards for publication. The presentation of the results found is very poor, very disorganized, even careless. The statistical analysis is poor. Most conclusions do not bring relevant information, are not new, and agree with the literature. Some conclusions and implications for practice are common sense and are always valid and important. That is, they are very general and cannot be explained by the pandemic.

Some more specific comments and remarks can be found next.

Comments

1. Careful proofreading is required. The quality of writing is acceptable, but some mistakes remain.
2. P.3, Materials and Methods

Line 2, "it will be sent between 24 September 2021 and 7 July 2022". This sentence has to be written in the past, of course.

"The online survey (Table 1) was created in an anonymous format using Google Modules" and "Only university students attending the third year or recent graduates in Health Professions in Italy were invited to this survey" (p. 6, third line from bottom) – However, there is no guarantee that respondents were all such students or graduates. Since it is anonymous, anyone could have had access to the survey and could have responded (recipients of the survey could easily share the link to the survey).

3. The survey should be moved to an appendix rather than being in the article.
4. P.7, third line, “with the t-test for independent samples” – The t-test requires normal, continuous variables. Was normality tested? It appears to me that the tested variables are categorical and thus not normal. In fact, two lines below, it is mentioned that the Kruskal-Wallis test was used. This is appropriate for nonnormal variables (when more than two groups are being compared). Therefore, it appears to me that the t-test should not have been used, but the Mann-Whitney test (which is equivalent to the K-W test for two groups) should have been used. Anyway, neither the t-test nor the Kruskal-Wallis test was used in the paper. Therefore, I see no reason to mention them.
5. P.7, Results, third line and following lines – Percentages should be added or should replace counts because percentages are much easier to interpret. That was done concerning many other questions. It should be done to all the questions.
6. P.7-11, Results – The text merely reproduces the values displayed in Table 2. It is too long, boring, takes much space, and adds nothing to Table 2. Reading the table is enough, and it is the same. Therefore, it would be much better to summarize the results and provide some conclusions, mentioning a few examples to illustrate. Merging the Results and Discussion sections would be a good alternative. In fact, the latter almost makes the former useless. The Results section could be discarded because it is a waste. I do suggest merging these two sections.
7. I suggest that Tables and Figures be moved to an appendix. Why are figures in different colors? They are too large; their size should be reduced.
8. P.14

Third line, “studio management” – The authors should explain what this is. I suspect this is a typo and it should be “study.”

Fourth line, “(2.76VS 3.28, Chi2=24.7134 p-value=0.000057)” – It is not clear what groups are being compared, nor what is being compared, i.e., what the hypothesis to be tested is. It is also not clear what the values 2.76 and 3.28 are.

Furthermore, the significance level used should be mentioned in the Material and methods section, on top of p.7, together with the statistical methods, and not here. The same remarks apply to the following paragraphs.

Fifth line, “(Fig.3)” – The authors fail to mention which is the question in Fig. 3 they are talking about, since the figure includes several questions.

Line 11, “Gaussian trend” – I do not know what a Gaussian trend is. I know what the Gaussian (or normal) distribution is, as I know what a trend is, but not a Gaussian trend. Moreover, what does a mean equal to 3.13 have to do with the normal distribution?

The whole paragraph, “Analysing... (fig. 3)”, is unclear. The authors fail to mention which subgroups are being compared and what the question is being analyzed.

Similar remarks apply to the following paragraphs, i.e., they are unclear.

9. P.16, four lines from bottom, “Younger students” – What ages are included here? How were the “younger” and “older” groups of students formed?

10. P.19, conclusions, “While most graduates ... job counselling” – These conclusions are very general; they are always valid, not only in post-pandemic times. They could have been written at any other time, and, as they are so general, they could have been written about any other profession. Thus, they are not valuable or new conclusions. Consequently, the paper does not bring any new or relevant results or conclusions.