

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	EXPERIENCES OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL STUDENTS OF PAKISTAN DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC LOCKDOWN: A QUALITATIVE STUDY
AUTHORS	Iftikhar, Sundus; Saleem, Sarosh; Aziz, Iqra; Sana, Momal

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Sara Rizvi Jafree Forman Christian College, Sociology
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Jul-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introductory LR is weak. More local and South Asian scholarship about medical and dental students during pandemic can be cited from last two years - More information is needed about the manual data analysis and theme generation. How many authors did this independently? were discussions held? was there disagreement? why a software was not used - Qualitative data analysis reliability has not been reported, for example peer review, participant review - The discussion is weak and limited. Results can be discussed better with reference to scholarship - There should be a separate Limitations section - Regulatory bodies and stakeholders, and their related policy post pandemic outbreak must be discussed and then further recommendations mentioned based on study findings
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Kiran Patel University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust, WISDEM Centre
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Sep-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	A well defined and clear qualitative study with clear Qs. The learning is important to share and I see no need for revision aside from checking grammar to ensure it is up to standard. Well done and a pleasure to read
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 comments	Authors' response	Page number
The introductory LR is weak. More local and South Asian scholarship about medical and dental students during pandemic can be cited from	Recent references have been added focusing on local studies	Pg # 4

last two years		
More information is needed about the manual data analysis and theme generation. How many authors did this independently? were discussions held? was there disagreement? why a software was not used	Reason for preferring manual analysis of data has been mentioned and highlighted in the manuscript	Pg # 6
Qualitative data analysis reliability has not been reported, for example peer review, participant review	Reliability check was mentioned on page 6 and has now been elaborated and highlighted	Pg # 6 & 7
The discussion is weak and limited. Results can be discussed better with reference to scholarship	New references added in discussion	Pg # 12
There should be a separate Limitations section	Done and highlighted	Pg # 12
Regulatory bodies and stakeholders, and their related policy post pandemic outbreak must be discussed and then further recommendations mentioned based on study findings	Separate heading for "Recommendations" has been highlighted. Last paragraph of recommendation for institutions explains why policies have not been discussed in this article	Pg # 12
Reviewer 2 comments	Authors' response	Page number
A well defined and clear qualitative study with clear Qs. The learning is important to share and I see no need for revision aside from checking grammar to ensure it is up to standard. Well done and a pleasure to read	All authors would like to thank the reviewer for their kind words and encouragement. The article was proofread by all authors and was sent to the English department as well	