Review of: "Medical Profession in Nigeria Since 1960"

Sana Jabbar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors,

I appreciate your research on such an important issue as "CORRUPTION IN THE MEDICAL FIELD." I have a few questions and suggestions as mentioned below that need to be addressed before publication.

I am also concerned about the validity of the study as the methodology and analysis in this study were not approached scientifically. For example, the criteria of the study population - most of which is media related - but the study mainly focused on medical professionals. The sample size is small for this type of research, and there were no details on the selection criteria, and no detail about the study questionnaire, its validity, or reliability. The data was self-analyzed/interpreted by researchers, so there are chances of bias.

1. I strongly recommend having a results/findings-focused title.
2. Please pay attention to English, as I found some sentences that need to be improved.
3. The objective of the study needs to be precise and relevant to the title.
4. In the method section, it would be better to add subheadings, including study design, study population, sampling/ sample size, collection of data, and data analysis.
5. Criteria for the study population and sample size need to be clarified. Is there any reference for this sample size?
6. Data collection and analysis should be clear, precise, and detailed. For example, how the data was collected, where the study was conducted, how the researcher approached participants initially, whether consent was taken, whether a questionnaire was distributed manually or if any blinding method was used, and whether the time was the same for all participants (same week, month, or year?) or not, etc.
7. In the demographic data, mention the area of study participants as is it the same as mentioned in the previous study (from 16 different states) or not? Also, mention separately the no. of medical professionals and medical students. It is important to know the number of medical professionals with clinical experience.
8. The questionnaire used in the study and the interview pattern needs to be explained. Mention either a new questionnaire was developed for this study, or a previous study scale is used. So that the reliability and validity of the study scale can be ensured.
9. Please explain the results in Table 2. Is it from interviewers only??? As mentioned, "the views of all interviewees are presented below." Then what about the results from the questionnaire? It is better to mention the analysis approach. Were all participants' responses analyzed together? I suggest making a bar chart for Table 2 to compare the results better.
10. Please mention the method for analyzing data. Was any statistical test applied to the study scale or were the results

based only on frequency and percentage?

11. An analysis exploring whether there was a significant difference among professions related to corruption is good to explore, and hence medical directors are frequently thought to be responsible for it. So, I suggest mentioning the participants from each medical profession separately in the demographic data.

12. As the data was interpreted by researchers from interviews, it is better to add more participants' views in data collection or provide supplementary data for it.

13. It would be better if the researcher also analyzed data according to the role of private or government public health centers or both in corruption. There should be a comparison to understand the main culprit behind medical corruption.

14. Most of the participants aged 29-39 for questionnaires and 40-50 for interviews, so how does it justify their claim/thoughts on different facts about medical corruption since 1960?

15. Need more references for the discussion section. The literature review can be precise, and it is better to add more references in the discussion compared to this study's results.

16. Please mention study limitations also.