

Peer Review

Review of: "Medical Education Gone Viral During the COVID-19 Pandemic"

Dumitru Sutoi¹

1. University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Timisoara, Romania

The topic presented in this manuscript is both timely and relevant, but several improvements can be made for it to be more in line with consensus. Below are several constructive recommendations that may enhance the overall quality and clarity of the manuscript:

- The manuscript would benefit from being structured according to conventional scientific writing standards (i.e., Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions). Currently, the boundaries between these sections are unclear. Introducing clear headings and subheadings would improve readability and organization.
- The Introduction should be expanded, with more citations that capture the current trends in medical teaching.
- The use of a flowchart might prove to be beneficial since it is a more organized way to present the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- The assessment of vulnerability and resilience is the main point of this manuscript, but they are not thoroughly analyzed. Although this is a pilot study, its purpose should still include assessing feasibility and identifying trends that may justify a larger-scale study.
- Exploring correlations between mental health outcomes and variables such as academic performance, social engagement, or clinical exposure would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the pandemic's impact on students' lives.
- The subject touched on seems to be a bit too vague and is approached from many different perspectives and approaches. A better definition of the main goals of the study and the tools used to better focus on certain aspects of medical teaching could be useful.

- To enhance the study's significance, consider including participants who experienced both pandemic-affected and regular (pre-/post-pandemic) education periods, allowing for a comparative analysis of teaching quality, mental health, and related factors.
- The use of non-validated diagnostic tools needs justification. If established tools are available, why were alternative ones used? Please describe the tools used, including whether they were newly developed, and elaborate on their structure and purpose. Additionally, if supportive therapy sessions were provided to participants, please present the outcomes of these interventions.
- What are some future directions that are going to be looked into? Future directions have been highlighted as a subtitle, but only conclusions have been drawn in the three written paragraphs.
- The control group in this study is not 100% necessary. Participants can be interviewed on their perspective before and after the pandemic.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.