Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Temperament, Character and Organisational Well-being among Obstetrics and Gynaecology Personnel"

Emil Anton[1]

1. University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Romania

The authors present an interesting and highly relevant pilot study investigating the relationship between personality dimensions (using Cloninger's bio-psycho-social model) and organizational well-being among obstetrics and gynecology personnel. Given the increasing focus on the mental health and occupational well-being of healthcare professionals, this research area is of significant importance. The use of validated psychometric tools, specifically the Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI) and the C.I.V.I.T. questionnaire, provides a solid foundation for the methodology.

However, there are several methodological limitations and a critical contradiction in the discussion section that need to be addressed to improve the scientific rigor and clarity of the manuscript.

- The most significant limitation is the small sample size of *N=38*. While the authors appropriately acknowledge this limitation and classify the work as a pilot study, the use of Pearson's correlations on such a small, non-randomized sample should be interpreted with extreme caution. The authors might want to consider or justify why parametric tests (Pearson) were chosen over non-parametric alternatives (e.g., Spearman's rank correlation), given that a normal distribution is difficult to establish with *N=38*.
- There is a direct contradiction in the manuscript regarding the primary findings. On page 15, the authors state: "it would appear from the results that temperament is the aspect of personality most closely related to the perception of well-being". However, just one page later in the formal Conclusion, the authors state the exact opposite: "In particular, it is not so much temperament... but character... that characterizes the perception of organizational well-being in one's work environment". This discrepancy is confusing for the reader and fundamentally undermines the core takeaway of the study.

doi.org/10.32388/B6X89W

The authors must revise the discussion and conclusion to ensure a consistent interpretation of their data.

- The sample is predominantly female (89.5%). While the authors correctly note that obstetrics departments often have a clear predominance of female staff, it is well-documented in the literature, and acknowledged by the authors themselves—that temperamental traits show significant gender differences. The results should therefore be strictly framed as specific to female healthcare workers in this specialty, avoiding broader generalizations about all healthcare personnel.
- In Table 6, the correlation table only shows the character traits (Self-Directedness, Cooperativeness, Self-Transcendence) correlated with well-being dimensions. However, the text also discusses significant correlations regarding the temperament trait of Novelty Seeking. It would be highly beneficial to include the temperament traits in the correlation matrix (or provide a separate table) so readers can visually assess the p -values and correlation coefficients for all dimensions discussed in the text.
- In several instances, the language leans slightly towards causality, which cannot be inferred from a cross-sectional correlational design. Phrases implying that specific traits "determine" or "characterize" outcomes should be softened to reflect association rather than causation.

The article provides valuable preliminary data but requires Major Revisions. The authors must resolve the conflicting statements in their discussion/conclusion, expand upon the statistical limitations of their sample size, and provide a more comprehensive presentation of their correlation data.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.