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

Abideen Salako[1]

1 Nigerian Institute of Medical Research

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the article titled Medical students' disease status of COVID-19: A multicenter study"

General Overview:

The research work is original and addresses an important subject matter.

Abstract:

It reflect content of the article.

Introduction:

There are few typographical errors. Please ensure uniformity in the "COVID" versus "Covid"

Please rephrase and merge the 5th and 6th Paragraph in the introduction to reflect   AS below

"Until now 1,486,361 confirmed cases of COVID-19 have been identified up till now in Pakistan out of which 210,726 cases are from the KP province. The total number of deaths reported in Pakistan is 29,801 while that in KP is 6,130. [9] The total number of people who have received 1 dose of vaccine is 119,150,808, and the number of those who have received two doses is 92,565,125. [10] The projected hospital admissions in Pakistan will be 52,930 on 23rd Feb 2022 as reported on 8th Jan 2022. [11]
However, there are few or no studies evaluating the burden and associated risk of COVID-19 disease among medical student in Pakistan. Thus, the aim of this research was to find out the COVID-19 infection status amongst undergraduate medical students of the KP province of Pakistan and to determine the relative risk of COVID-19 between preclinical and clinical years"

METHODS

We written with few typographical errors. The table 1: please ensure standardization in the spelling of COVID-19

The authors claimed it was a multi-centre study. How many medical school were involved across the district?

Was the sample size proportionate to the size of student in the medical school or was convenience sample across the

medical schools?

Was is self administered questionnaire?

What does self developed questionnaire imply?

What was the statistical method/test was used to assess relative risk.

Results:

Discussion:

Few typographical errors

Conclusion:

Author should review and rewrite the conclusion and ensure it reflect implication of policy

Decision: Recommended for publication on addressing needed corrections