

Review of: "The use of tele-education in medicine, during and beyond the COVID-19 pandemic: A commentary"

Joseph Cabore¹

¹ World Health Organization WHO

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Since the COVID-19 pandemic occurred, tele-education has been implemented in all directions through various platforms. In my view, any scientific article would therefore have the merit of providing something extra, if only in the context of sharing experiences.

I will make a few comments to improve the quality of this article submitted for review:

The title and introduction: The title of the article is quickly captivating. But after reading, one remains somewhat unsatisfied with the "commentary" aspect. The authors have indicated that "The purpose of creating a commentary is to report a concise review," but which type of article is it ultimately?

The methodology: A clear definition would have made it possible to better understand the key terms used (tele-education, tele-medicine, etc.), for instance, the "tele-education and any of its modalities." Furthermore, of course, the authors tried to be quite careful in using the term "brief methodology," but the fact remains that for a scientific article, a more detailed methodology is necessary to understand the findings. Why did they use only two search engines (PubMed and Google Scholar)? How was the inclusion/exclusion process of articles carried out? How many articles were selected at the end of the review, and on what criteria? No quantitative data is available, and no precise idea of the period covered by the articles selected. It's not clear whether the comments made are based on a qualitative analysis or a personal interpretation.

Discussions: Innovative strategies using new information and communication technologies only have value in health if they contribute to improving access to health care, through primary health care, with the well-understood objective of achieving UHC. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the use of tele-education platforms in low-income countries contributed to ensuring the safety of health personnel and patients, but above all, to re-establishing the continuity of essential health care, which had been disrupted. The need for continued access to essential health care was accentuated in fragile and marginalized communities in every country. The issue of the "affordability of the devices used and data packages in low-income countries" is not limited to students but also concerns frontline health workers in the PHC infrastructure. This critical piece, in my view, is missing in the discussions.

Conclusion: The purpose of the article deserves to be more precise, and a detailed methodology would make it possible to better perceive its usefulness to health scientists. The limitations of the paper should be highlighted in the discussions.

