

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Prevalence and characteristics of Medical Student Mistreatment in Lebanon

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Tamer Edirne

Submitted on: 19 Feb 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606710

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

aimed to determine the prevalence of medical student mistreatment in Lebanon; 48.7% being subject to mistreatment during clinical practice, associated with gender, type of university and family income, executed mostly by patients and their families/friends...

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

An important topic and well discussed internationally, the English needs proof-reading as some sentences are easy to misunderstand...

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.

- How many questions are in the survey and how long does it takes...
- Look at the BMJ's Reporting Patient and Public Involvement statement
- I cannot see the tables? Therefore I cant evaluate the results appropriately...
- pls. use (;)appropriately (do not use it at all?)
- STEM ?where is the explanation?
- reference 33 is missing? is Graduation Questionnaire really an important way to tackle this issue? reference?
- Are there evidence that "higher authorities should dedicate some resources to tackle this issue by introducing policies against it, spreading awareness among the public" is gonna help? and "that might help in capturing students' experiences and opinions on what should be done"?
- pls. avoid to start a sentence with numbers (%)...
-

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Well, prevalence maybe appropriate but management maybe replaced by "characteristics"?

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

No, quite a lot of sentences are easy to misinterpret and lack unity, a proofreading could be of benefit

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

No.

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.