

# Review of: "Medical Profession in Nigeria Since 1960"

Mary Akpan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Uyo

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Paragraph 1 of the Introduction: What comes to a reader's or reviewer's mind on seeing alphanumeric one in square brackets, that is [1], is that the authors chose to use the Vancouver referencing style. It is, however, very confusing that at the end of the manuscript, the authors have a list they call 'Footnotes', which lists the alphanumeric in square brackets, and very strangely, respondents' quotes (37, 38, 46-53) are numbered and listed in the Footnotes. There is another list called 'References', which lists sources without any order and is not referenced in the manuscript. Questions: a) What reference style did the authors use in preparing the manuscript? b) What is the difference between footnotes and references in the context of this manuscript, and why use the two? c) What is idid in Footnotes? d) Why are interview participants (e.g., Ms. Cathy) named in the footnotes? Shouldn't participants' confidentiality be protected in any reporting of this research?

Paragraph 3 of Medical Corruption in Literature, line 2: The authors should be consistent with the use of the past tense in reporting previous study findings. 'shows' in line 2 should read 'showed'

Paragraph 5 of Medical Corruption in Literature, line 1: Does #21 represent a single document/publication? It does not appear so in the footnote/reference list and the opening phrase in line 1. There are up to three publications listed against #21; these need to be separated and listed individually in the reference list. The sentence in line 1 should read: Several other scholars [21-23]

Paragraph 7 of Medical Corruption in Literature, line 6: 'identifies' should read 'identified'. #24 should have appeared at the first mention of Malcolm Sparrow or at the end of the opening sentence of the paragraph as Malcolm Sparrow's study [24]...

In paragraph 10 of Medical Corruption in Literature, line 1, which study showed, 27, 28, or 29? Again, 'shows' should read 'showed'.

What number is Chattopadhyay Subrata in paragraph 11 of Medical Corruption in Literature, line 1?

I would suggest rephrasing Exploring Research Design, Determining Population Size, and Outlining Sampling Procedures to: Research Design, Sample/Population Size, and Sampling Procedure.

Under Exploring Research Design, Determining Population Size, and Outlining Sampling Procedures: why were interviews not audio-recorded? There is a possibility the authors missed out on important information during the interviews while writing, as the interviewees were talking or answering questions.

Table 1: In your sample size calculation from a population of 63,351,813 from 16 states, an online sample size calculator gave a sample size of 185, comprising 68 medical practitioners and medical students and 117 media educators. Does your data in the questionnaire column mean that only media experts participated in the survey? If so, why were medics

and medical students excluded? How did you arrive at 268 participants for your interview? This number is not reported in your methodology description. Who participated in the interview, and what was the distribution?

Under the heading: Understanding the Nigerian Public Perception of Corruption within the Medical Sector, 61 persons out of a total of which number? 117 from the questionnaire, 268 from the interview, or 385? And why not represent findings in Table 2 as percentages, or both frequency and percentage for each item? Your readers will have a better insight if they read the percentage of the total. In addition, it is confusing which results (questionnaire or interview) are presented in Table 2. The opening sentence in the paragraph under Table 2 suggests it is from the interview, but the authors failed to indicate the source of the results from the outset. Then, the reader is presented with direct quotes from respondents; the question is: are findings from the interview presented as 'counts' or 'quotes'? The authors need to clarify which results are presented and how.

How/why are direct quotes from respondents numbered/referenced as sources of information contacted while preparing the manuscript? #37, 38, 46-53?

Footnotes/References #21 to #23 should be revised.