

# Review of: "Road Safety Perceptions and Practices among Undergraduate Medical Students"

Mulekya Francis Bwambale

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

The paper looks at road safety practices among undergraduate medical students at a university in Sanathnagar. The paper is purely descriptive and utilises data from a cross-sectional study of 207 students with a response rate of 39.4%. The study utilised a mixed study population of students and interns which sounds equivocal. The paper attempts to examine two objectives but these are not adequately answered by the findings. The paper is inadequate in terms of the available evidence, problem and rationale. Due to the weak methods, the findings and conclusions are considered invalid for the following reasons.

1. The problem and rationale for the study are not clearly articulated. The problem needs to be defined in terms of the local context and not global context. The literature review is not linked to the study objectives nor the findings of the study.
2. The findings for objectives 1 and 2 are not clearly described in the abstract and main paper. It would be good to also do a bivariate analysis of knowledge, Attitudes and practices across different demographic factors. The sample size of 207 seems inadequate. How was it calculated and what was the power of the study? The response rate of 39.4% is not acceptable for any scientific study.
3. The analysis is too basic and flawed. It lacks the analytical aspects. A more robust analytical approach should have been used, especially use of Odds ratios, confidence intervals and multivariate regression analysis to establish the factors associated with exposure to RTAs. Findings from the multivariate analysis should then be used to draw conclusion especially on objective 2.
4. The dependent and independent variables of the study, the sampling technique, sample size estimation, eligibility and exclusion criteria of the study subjects need to be well described in the methods. Details of how the variables were measured, especially exposure to RTAs as the outcome variable should be captured. The readers need to know which questions were asked? Which attitudes were measured and how were they measured? What knowledge questions were asked and how were these measured? Were the questions adopted from any national survey or other global instrument? If so, reference is needed.
5. There are several typos in the paper, starting from the abstract to the main paper. The authors also need to define all abbreviations and acronyms used in the paper.
6. The number of references are quite few, unless that is the requirement for the journal.

In view of the lack of a clear problem statement, limited literature review, weak methodology and inadequate findings which do not adequately answer the study objectives coupled with the poor English language command, I would



recommend major revisions of this paper.