

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Workplace violence among healthcare professionals in public and private health facilities in Bangladesh

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Andrew Gibbs

Submitted on: 08 Sep 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2021.1604396

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This paper is looking at the prevalence and risk factors for workplace violence (WPV) among healthcare workers in Bangladesh, using a self-selecting sample. It found 43% of healthcare staff had experienced violence and this was associated with shift work, working in the emergency room, being married, working in the public sector. It also looked descriptively at the response by management and feelings of those who had experienced violence.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations:

- 1) Needs greater work on the structure of the paper – described in detail below
- 2) Results and discussion could be reordered to reflect a better flow
- 3) Discussion needs to more closely reflect the adjusted analysis
- 4) Methodology needs greater explanation

Strengths

- 1) Basically a sound paper – with these actions required to strengthen it, rather than being a fundamental critique
- 2) Good sample size

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Major comments

- a) I think there needs to be a significant rewrite of a variety of sections. All the information is there (in general) but it is the ordering. In the introduction there is a lot of jumping around about topics. I like to think about it is an upside down triangle, where the broad topic is described (e.g. definition), global estimates then Bangladesh estimates of prevalence, then risk factors, then health impacts. Each paragraph focuses on one of these. In the current paper, this is not the case and paragraphs jump from prevalence to risk factors etc.
- 2) The methods need a bit more ordering and information. It would be good if the authors followed the STROBE guidelines to provide an ordering to this section of the paper. Again, almost everything is there, it is how the order flows. Important areas to strengthen: a) more information on the main measure for WPV – so number of items, response options, coding for the main analysis etc. b) More information on the sampling, how did they do the process, so we can understand limitations
- 3) In the results section, I wondered if it would make sense to first look at prevalence and risk factors (so both descriptive and unadjusted and adjusted analyses) and then look at responses and outcomes. May make the paper flow more clearly, as I struggled with the forwards and backwards nature.

4) In the results section, for risk factors, please only focus on the adjusted model as at times it just looked at the prevalence and in the adjusted models these were slightly different.

Minor

In the intro, sexual harassment and violence is not mentioned.

Line 41 quote, which is not finished

line 45/46, compared to whom are healthcare workers more likely to experience violence?

Line 132, "were not shifted workers" does not make sense

Line 190 – first need prevalence seen in study, rather than saying 15% lower – any ideas why the authors think this was the case?

Limitations – need to include not a representative sample

#### PLEASE COMMENT

**Q 4** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

**Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

**Q 6** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

**Q 7** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 9** Originality



**Q 10** Rigor



**Q 11** Significance to the field



**Q 12** Interest to a general audience



**Q 13** Quality of the writing



**Q 14** Overall scientific quality of the study



#### REVISION LEVEL

**Q 15** Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.