

Review of: "Understanding the Patterns of Hate Incidents and Reporting Attitudes at a UK University"

Paloma López Ros¹

¹ Universidad Miguel Hernández de Elche

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Congratulations on the work done, this is a very interesting topic that needs to be addressed. The sample size is very good. However, your manuscript requires necessary improvements.

1. In general, the lack of bibliographic references is present throughout the entire manuscript. Both in the introduction and in the supposed discussion of the results, references should be included that reinforce the comments and compare them with recent studies.
2. The data collection section must be strengthened. It does not specify, for example, the number of questions in the survey, the type of question, whether the questions were approved by a group of experts, whether they were first tested in a pilot group. Nor the type of sociodemographic data that was requested. There is no evidence of reliability of the instrument.
3. The thematic analysis carried out should be indicated more specifically. It is not very clear in the methodology section which one is going to follow. The results show that the Braun and Clarke (2006) methodology is used, but the themes and subthemes identified are not discussed. It only specifies two topics, but you should make an introduction to explain it and how the process was carried out.
4. The use of acronyms for "hate incidents" or synonyms would help with reading fluency.
5. The sections of the manuscript can be improved. I suggest changes to improve critical analysis. On the one hand, present the results clearly without the opinions of the authors or the limitations of the study. Next, a section discussing the results with bibliography from other authors to discuss the results obtained. And finally the limitations of the study. In my opinion, mentioning the limitations of the study throughout the entire manuscript reduces quality.
6. There is no discussion of the comparative results with recent studies. This should be improved and include bibliography that reinforces, supports or contradicts the results obtained.
7. The reading takes a long time. The results section could be improved by improving the tables. It is not necessary to repeat the contents of the tables in the text.