

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

Farida Abdali

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thanks for the opportunity. herewith some comments that may enhance the manuscript:

Abstract:

structured type abstract is utilized. it has no introduction which is crucial to provide an overview of what the study is about and its significance.

it is notable that authors are using "we" which is not recommended in scientific writing, it preferable to use third person pronouns.

Methods section in the abstract lacks several main aspects such as number of participants, name of the study tool used for data collection, sampling method and setting.

Results: 35 participants is extremally low to yield and generalizability of the study findings. although the participants are healthcare workers or students, yet they are heterogenous in term of the amount, types and frequencies of violence incidents that often faced and literature can prove that physicians differ significantly from nurses in term of rate and types of violence. similarly, students differ from employees in violence incidents.

"This has a significant negative impact on mental and psychological well-being. Some participants did not feel comfortable reporting the incidence of violence to their authorities due to the belief that no legal actions against the perpetrator, lack of organizational support, and fear that the appraisal or promotion avenues would be affected." this statement is not pertaining to the result section as there is no findings to support it. it can be moved to the discussion section.

"Some participants did not feel comfortable reporting the incidence of violence to their authorities" please add the numerical values because this is the result section. how many participants did not feel comfortable reporting the incidences?

conclusion section: is need to be rewritten. it is not relevant nor provide any valuable information.

overall, the abstract must be able to stand alone and provide an overview of the study in most appealing way. the current form of the abstract need various adjustments and amendments.

Theoretical framework:

reading through this section, it would be suggested to change the heading to introduction, as this section composed of theoretical definition of WPV in the first paragraph and then directly begins to the literature review.

“Violence against health workers is a rapidly rising global problem, particularly affecting emergency departments. The evidence suggests that the prevalence of violence in the workplace is directly proportional to the majority of violence in society.” please add reference to support this statement.

it suggested to highlight the different types of violence in healthcare settings and predators (physical, verbal and psychological) and (horizontal and vertical) as the literature indicate in many studies that violence and bullying behaviors can be coming from fellows worker esp. superior like managers or people at the same level of hierarchy.

no clear definition of characterization means.

in general the literature is well written, it may need rearrangement in more logical sequence to reach the gap of knowledge that is intended to fill.

justification

“Workplace violence is a daily reality for emergency physicians”, the justification is not sufficient or does not fit the study because this study contains different HCWs (physicians, nurses, students). in-fact physicians are accounted only 7 participants about 20% of the whole participants.

Methods:

please use standard headings in the methodology section such as: design, setting, participants, sampling, instrumentation, statistical analysis and ethical consideration.

search strategy: is this strategy used to find literature? because it hints that this is a review study while it actually a research paper.

if it is pertaining to the literature please move to the literature review section or otherwise delete to prevent any confusion.

scope of the study and population

please provide more details about sampling and data collection procedure. data collection was done in 4 days only!! how many eligible participants in the study setting? how sample size was calculated, what was your sampling method?

study protocol

please change this heading to study instrument or tool or instrumentation

what was the reliability and validity tests done? what was the score? was the tool piloted?

please provide further information regarding the translation of the study tool? what is the scientific background of the two experts evaluated the translation? what is the language of the tool that was provided to the participants?

what is the type of the tool? is it Likert ? how many possible scores?

Ethics:

is this study underwent IRB process for ethical approval?

data management and analysis:

what is the statistical analysis were rendered?

methodology section lacks very important aspect to replicate such study.

no sampling process, no sample calculation, no information about setting.

Results:

very low sample size (n=35)

response rate is not identified.

demographic characteristics especially the variation among participants' role must accorded with higher emphasize while commenting on the results.

please check and correct the percentage of women in table 1.

job categories like security guards and administrative had no participants. please remove as that provide no reason to mention.

worth to notice that about 63% of participants were students.

the results provide basic data (rates only) with very basic statistics. what statistical program was used to analyze data?

Discussion

it connect and compare the current findings to the literature in an appropriate manner however, the section in general requires more logical interpretation of the findings.

Conclusion

the study conclusion should be based on logical reasoning and evidence obtained from the findings. the current form of the conclusion needs further attention and should be clearly relevant to the study objective.

limitations

sample size is serious flaw to generalize the findings and there is no clear justifications to that issue.

the data collection duration is too short (4 days) which may effected the response rate.

it is not clear how researchers controlled the confounding factors in the study.

Recommendations:
