

# Review of: "Perceptions and Experiences of Human Right Violations of People Living with Mental Illness: A multi-centre descriptive cross-sectional study in Nigeria"

W.M. Oo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Aimst University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First and foremost, let me say congratulations to you for your nice work. The following are my comments:

1. (2.3. Study Population, Sampling Technique, and Sample Size) – You said, “The minimum sample size was determined using Slovin's formula. This formula is used when there is inadequate information about a population's behaviour (or the distribution of a behaviour) to otherwise know the appropriate sample size. Slovin's formula is also used for simple random sampling if the population to be sampled has obvious subgroups! The formula could be applied to each individual group instead of the whole group.” – Reference/Citation required!
2. (Table 1) –  $300 + 15 + 40 + 15 = 370$ ; not 470. You better said stratified sampling with proportional allocation (of sample size) to the number of patients at the time of data collection/sampling. However, I have some queries on proportional allocation. Check it out!
3. (2.6. Data analysis) – You stated, “For mean calculation, less than 2.5 was “poor or negative perception,” 2.5 to 3.5 was “good,” while above 3.5 was rated “very good.” Is this for “perception towards human right violations? Rephrase it to avoid confusion among readers.
4. (2.7. Ethical considerations) – Describe the approval numbers if applicable. Otherwise, it is better to say that ethical approval was obtained from the Research and Ethics Committees of the respective facilities included in this study (A, B, C, and D).
5. 3. Results (Patients' Perception of Human Right Violations) – You stated, “From the data in the table (4), the respondents' perceived average weighted mean of human rights breaches was 3.5! Is it a real weighted average (mean) or only a mean? If it is a weighted mean, describe what (which variable) is considered as the weight!
6. Reconsider the use of terminology (or names of categories) for the categories of perception towards human right violations. You used “good and very good”. It looks awkward! Better to be Very good and otherwise, etc. However, you said that it would be categorized into (less than 2.5 was) “poor or negative perception,” (2.5 to 3.5 was) “good,” (while above 3.5 was rated) “very good” in the data analysis (methodology).
7. Don't you want to assess if there is any association between the type of mental illness (patients' diagnosis) and the perception towards human right violations among respondents? Check your hypotheses again!

