Review of: "Medical Profession in Nigeria Since 1960"

Catalina Radu[1]

1 Academia de Studii Economice din Bucuresti

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors,

Your topic is intriguing; however, several elements could enhance the development of your contribution:

Title:

- The title may not accurately reflect the content. Instead of a broad term like "medical profession," consider specifying the focus on corrupt practices within the field.

Abstract:

- The abstract needs minor changes. For instance, the beginning would be better placed in the Introduction of the topic (an introductory sentence is normal in the abstract, yet this time there is too much of introduction in it: “Many Nigerians have lost confidence in the health sector as a result of untoward practices in the medical profession such as dishonesty, unethical or corrupt practices. The history of untoward practices in Nigeria’s medical profession dates back to the time of independence. Over time, the media have made assiduous efforts to raise public awareness about these practices in the country.” In the abstract, please ensure a concise yet comprehensive overview.

Literature review:

- Please include more academic sources after 2020. I can understand the review was primarily made before questionnaire and interviews, but it needs to be updated.

Research methods:

- Shorten the subtitle "Exploring Research Design, Determining Population Size, and Outlining Sampling Procedures" to a more concise term like “Research Methodology” / “Research methods”, etc.
- Mixed methods is a good choice, yet I would expect a little statistical analysis (I do not understand the use of SPSS, since the only numbers I saw reflected frequencies). How did the questionnaire look like? Have you used any particular scales? Maybe some associations / correlations / differences between groups?
- With respect to the qualitative part, a structure would help and show your contribution, your added value. You provided some quotations from the interviews, but these could be given only as examples for particular ideas. Maybe grouping based on your own criteria would be a nice contribution.
- Generally you should not repeat the data (in the table and in the text). However, if you do this, please be consistent –

i.e. “About 58.1% filled in the questionnaire, while 71% featured in the interviews.” – Maintain consistency in presenting decimals.

- At a point you wrote “The exact number of doctors remaining is not known” – by whom? In general, by particular respondents? Why is this situation this way? How can we interpret it?

Tables:

- Replace phrases like "The table below" with specific table numbers (e.g., "Table 1").
- Clearly explain how the tables were constructed, specifying if derived from questionnaires or interviews. For instance, you wrote “61 persons identified corruption to be absenteeism from work.” – I could not understand if it was 61 from total, from the ones who completed the questionnaire or from the interviewees. And how you actually counted them.

Discussion:

- Discussion should look at your findings in relation to the literature previously presented. Are the results surprising? How do they relate to the information in the literature? You tried to do something like this, yet some improvements are needed.

Conclusions:

- Please develop the Conclusions (plural) section. At this moment is seems more like an introduction, by re-stating the existence of corruption. Evidence from your own work should support the Conclusions.
- Please insist on recommendations and explain them.
- Also, you should take into account the limitations of your research and some future areas of research.

Footnotes and References:

- I would delete the Footnotes part and let only References (some of the ones included as Footnotes can be maintained as References, others not – interviews are part of your research, you should not place them there; also, there are many that are missing the necessary details, including publication and year – i.e. “[12] Adegboyega and Abdulkareem, “Corruption in Nigerian Public Health Care Delivery System,” 98-114”, or “[15] Onwujekwe, et al., “Corruption in the Nigerian health sector has many faces.” “

English and style:

- I am not a native speaker of English; I could easily understand the text, but I could also observe some mistake – long sentences, repetitions, missing / incorrect articles and prepositions, order of words in the sentences, etc.. Revise sentence structure for conciseness and clarity.
- Adjust the writing style to align more closely with academic standards, avoiding an overly casual or journalistic tone.

I do hope that these ideas will help you improve your paper.

Good luck with your work!