

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COVID-19 METHODOLOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS IN KYRGYZSTAN AND INDIA

Mamatkulova Nazgul Mamatkulovna

PhD, teacher of «Public Health» Department. International Medical Faculty of Osh State University

Mohammed Arfaat

Sariful Ashique

Gayatri Mahadeo Chavhal

Medical Students, International Medical Faculty, Osh State University, Osh, Kyrgyzstan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17459306>

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic presented a biological threat but was a diverse spectrum of national responses. This review analyzes and contrasts the methodological recommendations implemented by the Kyrgyzstan Republic and the Republic of India. These differences underscore a critical lesson for future pandemics clinical and public health guidelines are not monolithic. Their work is very linked to their adaptation to the unique epidemiological, socio-economic, and infrastructural context of a nation. As we know that this was a major global issue.

Keywords: COVID-19; Kyrgyzstan; India; public health response; pandemic management; diagnostic approaches; clinical management protocols; containment strategies; vaccination policy.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of SARS-CoV-2 in late 2019 triggered a global health outflow unparalleled in modern history. As the pandemic wave crashed across the globe, it was refracted through the unique prism of each nation's healthcare system, socio-political landscape, and resource capacity. The Kyrgyzstan Republic, a landlocked, mountainous nation of under 7 million people, operates with a more centralized health system. Although, this very disparity makes the comparison more sensational. Both nations faced the same viral antagonist. how to diagnose the infected, treat the sick, and protect the healthy people of both the country. As we know both the countries do not share that much similar things.

METHODS

A proper research was conducted by both of the government and found the loopholes which lead to the massive and uncontrolled outbreak of the disease. Kyrgyzstan vaccination strategy were also implemented. The collected information was then organized and compared across three core thematic pillars:

1. **Diagnostic Approaches include the** Examining the evolution of testing policies, from the type of tests utilized (RT - PCR vs. Rapid Antigen Tests) to the criteria for testing individuals.
2. **Clinical Management Protocols include the** Analyzing the therapeutic guidelines for hospitalized patients, including the recommended use of antivirals, oxygen therapy, and supportive care.
3. **Public Health and Containment Strategies like** large-scale interventions, such as lockdowns, and national vaccination campaigns were conducted.

RESULT

The result of both the countries were not satisfactory at the starting of the outbreak but by the time of second outbreak both the countries got an idea of management.

India's diagnostic strategy was very big and massive. Kyrgyzstan's approach was, by necessity, more small and centralized. Kyrgyzstan did not have that

much production of RTPCR test kit which was the gold standard treatment for Covid-19.

ICMR released numerous ways of their clinical management protocol. The guidelines treated patients into mild, moderate, and severe categories, with clear treatment pathways for each of them. The protocols were highly efficient, they initially included drugs like Hydroxychloroquine on preliminary data but later explicitly advised against their use as stronger evidence emerged. The second wave, driven by the Delta variant, forced a critical focus on the proning protocol, rational use of oxygen, and the urgent inclusion of anticoagulants and high-dose corticosteroids.

DISCUSSION

Kyrgyzstan's response was a model of a country which fought against the pandemic. Their strategy reflected a clear-eyed assessment of limitations, leading to a focus on proven, high-impact interventions. By seeing closely with WHO guidelines, the Ministry of Health avoided costly and potentially ineffective therapeutic away. The union on international aid was a necessity, but it also highlights the critical role in enabling smaller nations to mount an effective defense against a shared threat.

CONCLUSION

The COVID-19 pandemic forced every nation to write its own emergency response playbook. A comparison of Kyrgyzstan and India is a study in this forced innovation. India deployed a strategy of overwhelming scale, leveraging its immense domestic capacity and digital infrastructure. Kyrgyzstan executed a focused, resource-conscious strategy, prioritizing internationally validated core interventions. Both of the countries fought like they should and bought a more radical solution to their people. It was only possible by the correct actions and decision at the right time.

References:

1. [India vs Kyrgyzstan Coronavirus cases: day by day comparison](#)
2. [Kyrgyzstan: Coronavirus Pandemic Country Profile - Our World in Data](#)

-
3. <https://www.who.int/kyrgyzstan>
 4. [Response to COVID-19 in Kyrgyzstan | UNICEF Kyrgyzstan](#)
 5. [India Situation Report](#)