

Review of: "COVID-19: Health risk factors among students' population in Albania"

Carlos Sampaio Laranjeira¹

¹ Instituto Politécnico de Leiria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I appreciate the opportunity to review this manuscript and hope my comments assist in the revision process. The material is interesting and the topic is timely and relevant. The method seems to have been followed faithfully and the authors were well-positioned to conduct the analysis. Despite these positives, in my view, the paper needs more work before it could be published and I have made some specific suggestions below.

- The literature addressed is described accurately so far as I can see. However, there is no clear distinction between manuscript sections in terms of the content they report. First, I suggest dividing the section "INTRODUCTION" into three components, respectively introduction (explain the general argument of the paper, without going into specific details) background (situate the study concepts within the context of extant knowledge, discuss the international relevance of the concepts) and purpose, creating greater clarity in the analysis of the reader. What is the study's biggest contribution? The contribution should be clearly stated in the introduction.

- As a reader, I was a bit confused with regard to the purpose addressed in this study. Please provide the specific questions/hypotheses under study, it would be useful for the readers.

Method

- In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cross-sectional reporting guidelines.

- Sample selection (criteria should be detailed - internet access, reading and writing in the language under study)? A Rationale is needed for the sampling procedure used?- Some subjects refused to participate. Response rate?

- Were the sample sizes sufficiently powered to detect effects? How did the researchers decide on sample size?

- The process of analysis should be made as transparent as possible. What strategies were used to avoid duplications or fraud in the online survey? Did you analyze any potential non-response bias? And early vs late bias? Did you check if data can suffer from common method bias?

- The ethical aspects in collecting data are not specifically clarified, independently of the voluntary nature of the subject's participation and the approval by the local IRB, variables such as the offer of incentives to participate (how participants were recruited and whether they were compensated for participation), sharing and use of data and informed consent are not patent.

Results

- There are many tables showing the data. Could the authors consider reducing the number of those to only those most relevant & critical to the study findings?

Discussion

- Some of the contributions that are highlighted here could be flagged in the introduction for a more consistent narrative throughout the paper. Discussion can be improved if questions/hypotheses will be outlined in the introduction, then answered suitably in this section, and the results interpreted appropriately. I believe there should be better integration of the results with the existing literature.
- A stronger discussion of implications for future research and potential intervention work is needed. Identify recommendations for practice/research/education/management as appropriate, and consistent with limitations, in order to more fully allow readers to understand the extent to which the authors were able to answer the research questions and to grasp the limitations of this study.
- Theoretical and methodological limitations should be emphasized more deeply.

CHECKLIST FOR STYLE

- The manuscript will serve a broad audience of students, researchers, and practitioners, however, the manuscript needs to be carefully and attentively proofread, because some sentences are awkwardly constructed, punctuation is deficient, and therefore reading is occasionally difficult to follow. That leads me to believe that it needs careful editing by a native English speaker.