

Review of: "Characterization of Workplace Violence in Healthcare Workers at an Emergency Room in Bogotá, Colombia"

Linda Franchini¹

¹ Ospedale di San Raffaele Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I read with interest the article "Characterization of Workplace Violence in Healthcare Workers at an Emergency Room in Bogotá, Colombia". By Alarcon AN and colleagues.

Aggression and violence issues experienced on the workplace has been globally recognized as a public health issue. In this sense, the subject matter is a hot topic of clinical practice.

Methods are sufficiently explained respect to the instrument, but it is not clear how the participants were enrolled: it is important considering the main limitation admitted by the Authors: "the main limitation of this study was the low percentage.....that answered the questioner".

Result section is not clear. Authors indicate that "A total of 35 doctors..." but, if I have understood correctly, the description of professional qualifications of participants to the study listed in Table 1 indicates a majority (22/35 62.8%) of student. This incongruous point needs an explanation because this type of sample conditions results and the discussion have to be revised taking into account the experience of the participants in the interview.

In fact, in Literature there are data concerning the experience of violence by trained doctors and nurses. On the contrary, there are few data regarding personnel in training who could have different psychological resources to react. Considering a student sample also the result "years of experience in the emergency department" needs a narrower specification: it is not the same 0 experience or 5 years of experience!

Moreover, in Table 1 Professional Qualification column is indicate twice and Marital Status column is missing. Secondly, in order to provide a clearer fruition of the results, the reviewer advises to reconsider some lines in Table 1, in particular to cross-out the lines with "0" subjects.

At last, various grammatical typos have to be corrected throughout the paper i.e. in the method paragraph of the abstract there is a lacking "was" between "study" and "carried". Abbreviations (i.e. WPV) should be explained before use.

Speaking of grammar, the reviewer suggest a rephrasing of some sentences throughout the manuscript which sometimes seemed hardly understandable; more specifically the reviewer suggest to revise the last sentence of the result paragraph and repeated few times along the paper.

