

Review of: "Skin related health issues among health care workers due to utilizing of personal protective equipment during COVID-19 pandemic in Pakistan"

linda odikpo¹

¹ Nnamdi Azikiwe University

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The article is a good one but need major revision before it can be published.

Comments on abstract: The abstract was detailed but need to be critically restructured. The statement in introductory aspect of abstract 'In December 2019, another COVID was found in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China, on that time it spread quickly the nation over, drawing in worldwide consideration' may need to be revisited. some comments by reviewer; Citation in abstract may not be necessary and not encouraged as abstract appear in database search but not the references.

Recast the introduction in abstract section, a concise and meaningful statement may cover what ever the authors wish to express.

Was the data collection from health care workers children as stated here 'Data were collected via, structured questionnaire from 52 health care workers (Doctors, Registered Nurses & Health Care Assistant) children through purpose sampling technique studying.'

The statement 'Participants were approached after taking verbal consent. Data were collected online through google forms, and Whats App groups. ' is quite complicating. Consent verbally, then data collection google form. Can you reconsider this?

Method: the sample '52' is too small to be used for this study covering Pakistan and a quantitative study for that matter. Majority nurses 94% there about , what of other health care workers? Doctors, pharmacy, laboratory scientist? Etc. Health care workers should include these persons and not majorly nurses in other to enrich this sample and make a reasonable and generalizable conclusion.

method. Only a few sample of health workers from a tertiary hospital.

Title: The title of the study is relevant and informative.

There are no research questions and the objectives of the study were not stated in line with the presented results.

References: The references are relevant, and the very key studies included although few in number

Introduction: Previous knowledge on the study is clear although the research questions were not clearly outlined. The study's background was concise and understandable. There is need to demonstrate the gap that this study needs to fill

Method: The sample selection process is not clear to be appropriately measured. The study is subject to replication If properly harnessed. The method is valid but not reliable and the validity/ reliability of the instrument questionable. The calculated sample size was 100 but due to time constrain it was reduced to 52. This statement by the author is poorly

understood. Why?

What is the significance of this value '0.75 and 0.82' in your reliability test?

Results: Data was appropriately presented, tables and figures are relevant and clearly presented.

The tables had accurate titles and label. The result is clear, meaningful and although somewhat poorly grouped.

Discussion and conclusion: discuss the result from several angles and place into context.

The conclusion answers the aim of the study although need to be revisited.

The authors did not state the limitation to the study