

Peer Review

Review of: "Virtual Reality in Medical Education: Prometheus' Gift or Pandora's Box?"

Abdullahi Abubakar Yunusa¹

1. Department of Curriculum Studies & Educational Technology, Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto, Nigeria

The authors made significant efforts contributing to the evolving discourse on the advances of technology in human activities and the associated consequences. The main focus of the discussion is on the advantages/benefits and the risks that these tools pose, particularly Virtual Reality, to the health of the eyes and its impact on general well-being. Despite the significant insights the paper provided regarding the historical trajectory of the growth and development of VR, the advantages and disadvantages, as well as a detailed description with relevant citations of the positive and negative implications of using VR, the paper fell a bit short of being an opinion paper. It would have been more robust if it were presented from evidence-based perspectives such as a systematic literature review, scoping review, or meta-analysis as an evidence-based process. Nonetheless, the paper is well-structured in terms of language and organization of thoughts and ideas. Areas that require attention to improve the paper include the absence of keywords in the Abstract, while other areas were highlighted in the body of the text with comments in some cases. There is a need to deepen the discussion on the analogy of 'Prometheus' gift' vs 'Pandora's Box' in the proper context of the paper.

In the Introduction, as a way of dovetailing into the main focus of the paper, the significance of the paper should be discussed in a detailed but concise form. Under the definition, there was no discussion of how the metaverse is also a form of VR. To enhance the flow of thoughts between paragraphs, there should be the use of linkages to state how the metaverse is a form of VR. There should be a statement introducing the figure in the text before the figure itself, e.g., "Figure 1 illustrates..... Figure 2 shows the different classifications of Virtual Reality,"

I failed to see clearly from the lens through which the paper was conceived which of the two divides the VR technology falls into from the discussion. Even though the authors concluded that VR is neither

Prometheus' Gift nor Pandora's Box, more details are required to situate this position properly. Given the fact that the paper is based on opinion, the heading on “Possible future studies” should rather be “Suggestions for future research,” and this should be premised on the conclusion drawn based on the analysis of the role of VR in education, health, and everyday life. I think the ideas advanced in the paper are significant but would be better highlighted/presented in a systematic review of literature aimed at identifying two opposing roles or impacts of VR. For references, I suggest the authors refer to the guidelines for the use of the relevant referencing style, as I am not sure I understand the referencing style adopted in the paper.

A revision based on these observations would enhance the quality of the paper.

Attachments: available at <https://doi.org/10.32388/Z4EToC>

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.