

Review of: "Allergies In India: Myths, Misconceptions, and Awareness"

Sheikh Mohd Saleem¹

¹ Government Medical College Srinagar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study conducted by the authors aimed to investigate the myths, misconceptions, and awareness of allergic diseases in the Indian population. The findings presented in the manuscript shed light on the prevalent misconceptions and knowledge gaps related to allergies. However, there are certain deficiencies that need to be addressed before considering the publication of this study. The following points outline the major areas of concern:

Lack of background and context: The introduction does not provide sufficient background information on the significance of allergic diseases in India or globally. It is important to establish the importance of addressing misconceptions and improving awareness in the context of the healthcare system and public health.

Methodology limitations: The materials and methods section lacks important details regarding the selection criteria for the study participants. Additionally, the survey questionnaire used in the study should be described more comprehensively, including the rationale behind selecting specific questions and any validation or pilot testing conducted.

Inadequate data presentation: The presentation of results in the form of tables is appreciated, but the interpretation and discussion of these findings are insufficient. The authors should provide a detailed analysis and interpretation of the results, linking them to existing literature and addressing their implications for allergic disease management and public health interventions.

Limited generalizability: The study population appears to be limited to patients attending a specific clinic, which may not be representative of the entire Indian population. It is crucial to discuss the potential limitations and generalizability of the findings to ensure their applicability beyond the study sample.

Recommendations for future research and interventions: The discussion section lacks recommendations for future research and interventions based on the study findings. It would be valuable to suggest strategies for improving awareness and dispelling myths about allergic diseases, considering the unique cultural and social aspects of the Indian population.

Lack of ethical considerations: The manuscript does not mention ethical considerations such as obtaining informed consent from participants or obtaining approval from an ethical review board. It is necessary to address these ethical aspects to ensure the validity and integrity of the study.

Sample size and representativeness: The authors should provide a justification for the selected sample size of 1,104

patients and discuss whether it adequately represents the target population. Including information on the demographic characteristics of the study participants, such as age, gender, and geographic distribution, would help assess the representativeness of the sample.

Questionnaire design and validation: The manuscript lacks information on the development and validation of the questionnaire used in the study. It is essential to describe the process of questionnaire development, including any steps taken to ensure the reliability and validity of the instrument. Additionally, the authors should consider providing the internal consistency measures (e.g., Cronbach's alpha) for the questionnaire items.

Discussion of potential biases: The study design and data collection methods may introduce biases that should be acknowledged and discussed. For instance, self-reporting biases or selection biases could impact the findings. Discussing these potential biases would strengthen the interpretation of the results and provide a more nuanced understanding of the study limitations.

Comparison with existing literature: The authors should compare their findings with previous studies conducted in India or other similar populations to provide a broader context. This would help identify consistencies or disparities in the prevalence of myths and misconceptions and contribute to the existing knowledge on allergic diseases.

Recommendations for interventions and policy changes: The discussion section should include recommendations for interventions and policy changes based on the study findings. Identifying specific areas where public health campaigns, educational programs, or policy initiatives are needed would enhance the practical relevance and impact of the research.

Conclusion and key takeaways: The conclusion section could be strengthened by summarizing the key findings, emphasizing their significance, and reiterating the implications for healthcare professionals, policymakers, and the general public. Providing a concise and impactful conclusion will leave a lasting impression on readers.