Review of: "Medical students' disease status of COVID-19: A multicenter study"

Ildar Fakhradiyev[1]

1 Kazakh National Medical University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of "Medical students' disease status of COVID-19: A multicenter study"

The research paper offers a significant contribution to the field, providing crucial insights on the disease status of COVID-19 among medical students. Nonetheless, certain areas could benefit from additional clarity, detail, and structural modifications to enhance the paper's comprehension and impact.

Introduction:
While the introduction broadly outlines the scope of the study, it could benefit from more structured paragraphs and smoother transitions. Segregating information about COVID-19's initial spread, mode of transmission, the specific situation in Pakistan, and the study's objectives into distinct sections would enhance readability.

Additionally, the detailed figures regarding confirmed cases, deaths, and vaccination status in Pakistan appear somewhat misplaced. While these are important to contextualize, their specificity might be better placed in the results or discussion sections, where they could be compared to the study's findings. In the introduction, a broader context might suffice.

Methods:
The methodology could be further elaborated for better comprehension and replicability. It would be beneficial to mention the total number of medical and dental colleges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa included in the study. Furthermore, the survey's reliability should be confirmed via Cronbach's alpha testing. Also, the absence of a section detailing statistical processing of the research results is a noticeable omission that needs to be addressed.

Results:
The results section, while providing an overview of the general COVID-19 rate, self-isolation rate, hospital admission rate, and vaccination rate, could delve deeper into the data. More granular analyses, such as symptom variation among different age groups or between genders, or any correlation between self-isolation and course year, or vaccination status and infection rate, would augment the paper's relevance and usefulness.

A notable shortcoming is the lack of descriptions for tables and figures within the results section. This can cause confusion for readers trying to follow the data narrative and should be included for a comprehensive understanding of the results.

Conclusion:

The conclusion appears somewhat generalized and lacking specific context. Stating that the situation is "comparable to the rest of the world" lacks specificity. It would be beneficial to elaborate on the specific measures taken by the government and private health sectors in your conclusion. Adding more context and grounding your conclusion on specific findings from your data would strengthen your conclusion. If possible, the paper would also benefit from including suggestions for improvement based on your findings.

Overall, the paper provides valuable insights but could be significantly improved by addressing these points. By enhancing clarity and adding more depth, the paper could better articulate its contributions and implications for the scientific community.