

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

Ana Cristina Oliveira

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The pertinence of the theme is notorious. Violence in the workplace is a reality and the health area is no exception.

In the abstract, the conclusions are sparse and do not reflect the conclusions drawn from the work. This section should be improved. In the theoretical framework, the referred studies are from different contexts/countries (Egypt, Turkey, USA, Italy) that may be different from the reality in Colombia.

The English throughout the article should be revised; concepts such as "justification", "study aims", "we searched", "the study authors only manipulated the data", "questionary" are examples of this.

The data collection time was 5 days. What is the reason? This fact may have conditioned the sample and should be considered in the limitations.

Table 1 contains repeated information. Where it reads "marital status", the data that follow refer to "professional qualification".

At a certain point, there are incoherent sentences, in which the meaning is not understood ("Approximately 91.4% of the staff have experienced verbal altercatoinis at their workplace, however 22.8% weekly...").

Table 2 is too long and makes it difficult to read and understand the data; perhaps a summary table would help.

In the discussion, at a certain point he mentions that women, due to a greater empathetic attitude, end up suffering more from violence. However, one of the components in health communication involves empathy. How can we consider it: a protective factor, in the sense of the quality of the relationship that is established? Or a risk factor, as it increases vulnerability to violence?

The conclusions deserve to be further developed and reflect the practical implications drawn from the discussion of the study data/results.