

Review of: "Forecasting by Analogy: A Parallel between the Trend of Confirmed COVID-19 Deaths in the Winters of 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 in Italy"

Yemane Asmelash Gebretensae¹

1 Aksum University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- 1. The decision to use basic metrics instead of traditional epidemiological models is justified, but acknowledging potential limitations is crucial.
- 2. The analysis does not extensively consider external factors that could influence the dynamics of the pandemic, such as the emergence of new variants, changes in public behavior, or vaccination rates. Addressing these factors could strengthen the predictive model.
- 3. The study lacks a sensitivity analysis to assess how variations in the assumptions or input parameters could impact the predictions. This analysis would provide insights into the robustness of the forecasting model.
- 4. The research does not explicitly consider the potential impact of public health interventions or policy measures on the trajectory of the pandemic. Understanding how interventions may alter growth and decline rates is crucial for accurate predictions.
- 5. The study solely relies on the analogy approach without exploring alternative forecasting models. A comparative analysis with other established models or methodologies could identify the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches.
- 6. The study doesn't comprehensively consider all relevant variables that could impact COVID-19 dynamics, such as vaccination rates, emergence of new variants, or changes in public behavior. Ignoring these factors may limit the accuracy of predictions.
- 7. It's essential to emphasize the speculative nature of predictions based on analogy, given the dynamic nature of the pandemic. Peer review and validation against real-time data will be crucial for validating the forecasting model.
- 8. Additionally, the study could benefit from a discussion on the potential impact of evolving variants and vaccination rates on the forecast accuracy.
- 9. Strengthening the discussion section and emphasizing the need for ongoing validation would enhance the overall impact of the research.

Qeios ID: CMCCIZ · https://doi.org/10.32388/CMCCIZ

