

Review of: "COVID-19 Crisis: Exploring Challenges, Opportunities, and Cautions"

Werner Rothengatter¹

¹ Karlsruhe Institute of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Numerous articles, special issues, and monographs have been published on the Covid-19 pandemic, its nature, its spatial distribution, and its impacts on health, economy, and social life. Considering the existing knowledge base, which is documented in the literature, the article by Brahmanandam et al. does not present relevant new information.

The challenges mentioned (public health, economic impacts, educational, social dynamics) are described in a most general and qualitative way. In the section on opportunities for innovation and resilience, some well-known examples of medical progress, vaccination, and digital technologies for remote work are mentioned. "Creative solutions to complex problems" are verbally mentioned but not worked out in detail. The section on cautions for tackling ensuing pandemics includes well-known insights on the role of transport in virus distribution, as well as key rules for healthcare, social distancing, and mask wearing. Reference is made to another article by the authors (from 2020) where the reader can find some quantitative results.

The reader hopes to find an original approach from the authors in section 5, in which the potential periodicity of pandemic events is discussed. The authors give some examples which support the hypothesis that pandemic events occur at century intervals, e.g., the Spanish Flu. However, they don't present statistical evidence for a century-interval periodicity. Instead, they perform a survey asking for people's opinions on the cyclical nature of pandemics. The description of the survey and its analysis and interpretation lacks scientific standards:

- No statistics on the number of questioned people and their socio-economic characteristics are given. Particularly, the knowledge level of questioned people (e.g., from a rural region in India) is not given.
- The question(s) raised are not precisely described.
- It is not clear why a "neutrosophic logic" was necessary to evaluate the responses to a simple question and how it was applied to produce the presented simple result.
- The result does not give rise to a meaningful interpretation, e.g., the revealed opinion of people is not compared to available statistics on pandemic events.

The paper addresses a very interesting topic, but its scientific quality is poor.