

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Speaking up about patient safety, withholding voice and safety climate in clinical settings: a cross-sectional study among Ibero-American healthcare students

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Milena Trifunovic-Koenig

Submitted on: 28 May 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607406

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This study focuses on the speaking up behavior among Ibero-American healthcare students, with a large sample size. The aim was to assess speaking up behavior and safety concerns, while also validating a new instrument for measuring speaking up behavior in Spanish. For me the most important finding is that one third of students did not speak up although they had recognized an error regarding patient safety.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The study involved a large number of participants, providing robust statistical power. While the authors suggest that the sample may not be large in terms of percentage of the population across three countries, it is a statistically speaking a large study.

Speaking up behavior in healthcare settings is a critical but under-researched area. This study addresses an important gap in the literature, contributing to the factors that influence healthcare students' willingness to speak up about safety concerns.

Limitations are some methodological points listed in the review report that need to be explained.

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.

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your manuscript and the opportunity to review it. The topic is very important, and it is clear that you have put significant effort into this work. The overall quality of the manuscript is good. However, there are several points that should be addressed:

Abstract

The abstract is well-written, but please specify how the validation was conducted and what types of validity were assessed.

Introduction

The introduction is generally well done, but it would be beneficial to provide more context about the situation of healthcare students in Ibero-American countries. Discuss why you think the results may or may not align with those of students from other regions, possibly due to cultural differences.

Explain in which academic year students typically engage in clinical practice.

Methods

Clarify what constitutes a small, medium, or large effect according to Cramér's V.
Briefly explain the probability of superiority (ps) and provide references. Also, describe how to interpret the ps value more precisely.
Justify the use of stepwise regression in your analysis.

Results

When reporting chi-square values, use the chi-square (df) format.
Include an interpretation of the effect size, indicating whether you believe the effect is small, medium, or large. For me, the ps values seem low for all comparisons as they are below 50%; please comment on this.

Discussion

Address the factor validity of the scale. You have only mentioned conducting factor validity; what about other forms of validity such as discriminant, convergent, and criterion validity?
You did not conduct analyses for different countries. I believe that this would be interesting and could provide additional insights. How do you estimate the cross-cultural validity of the instrument?

I look forward to your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,
Milena Trifunovic-König

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?

I am not a native speaker, but I believe that the language was okay. The manuscript was easy to follow.

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:

Minor revisions.