

# Review of: "Temperament, Character and Organisational Well-being among Obstetrics and Gynaecology Personnel"

Navya Kumar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Leveraging Cloninger is certainly a novelty - authors are commended. However, the overall work can be substantially strengthened in the following ways:

- 1. ABSTRACT:** The abstract must be compelling and complete in such that it should attract a reader and be sufficient if the reader does not want to read the whole article. In that context please revisit. **Background** - should be about why this study was thought required (e.g., the cohort performs critical service but may be known to struggle with well-being and so the study seeks to identify influencing factors) and not just that a certain theory is relatively less used. **Objective** - please do not use abbreviations without first having shared the full form. The reader does not what the alphabets NS, HA, etc. mean. **Method** - Again, please avoid abbreviations. Also, mean and standard deviation of sample age is not critical to the study and may be avoided. Thirty-eight is a very small sample especially for a quantitative study, hence please give a line that could justify the size or anything special about this sample. For example, the entire workforce of some hospital or one representative individual taken from 38 hospitals. Also, please call out the instruments used only if there is some novelty such as a modification you made etc. Instead, please use this segment to note the method of analysis - Pearson's correlation. **Results** - Please see if this can be written using more conversational language than technical phrases so that even a layperson without knowing any of the theory can understand. For example, instead of prevailing temperament was reward dependence, could say staff temperament leaned largely toward responding to social rewards (reward dependence) and their character toward being tolerant and helpful (cooperative). Similarly for the associations between temperament and well-being. **Conclusion** - Am really unsure what this segment is trying to highlight. This must be the key takeaway of the entire paper. Not sure that's happening.
- 2. INTRODUCTION:** Please set the context. Open with why such a study in the chosen populace was felt needed. Starting with definitions of organization well-being, biopsychosocial model etc. is not giving the reader any background into why this study is important and needed. Then include the other studies trying to link personal temperament or character (however measured and by whatever theory) with organizational well-being. What are some overarching findings? What is the gap that this study would address? What is the novelty? The need for this piece is not clearly highlighted. Please do not use introduction for literature review. Which seems to be somewhat of the case here.
- 3. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES:** It seems that literature review and hypotheses are all fit into 1.4 Objective... within Introduction. Not sure this demonstrates sufficient rigor. A more robust and methodical literature review is required. The few citations made to launch the concepts of Cloninger, well-being, and other in the

Introduction section are not sufficient. Also, hypotheses need to be clearly called out. Saying “hypothesize a correlation between ...” seems insufficient. The authors note the distinction between temperament and character but blend everything (e.g., self-directedness) under temperament here. Please split elements and detail out hypotheses more, supported by literature review.

4. **METHODS: Sample** - where was this sample chosen from and how? What was the process? Why does this small a sample seem sufficient to go ahead with a quantitative study? Is the study itself just exploratory - for a larger sample down the line? **Procedure** - Was the survey administered in person or virtually? Were others looking when individuals were answering? Was this a group setting? These kinds of details can affect responses. **Instruments** - In an appendix or other segment, please share all the actual items and in this Instruments segment share some sample items. The Cloninger elements are explained in the Introduction segment (e.g., what does NS mean). But the various elements of organizational well-being, hierarchical superior, etc. are not familiar to the reader. Please give at least a one line explanation and sample item for these.
5. **RESULTS: Statistical Analysis** - This belongs under Methods not Results. Why was Pearson's Correlation chosen? Pearson's Correlation is not the best for ordinal or categorical data, which seems to be the case here. Pearson's also assumes normality, which would appear unlikely in this very small sample. The authors are urged to examine possible non-parametric correlation methods that accommodate ordinal or categorical data. **Descriptive Statistics** - Please also provide skewness and kurtosis measures. Given the small sample, becomes harder to ignore. **Inferential Statistics** - Please include table on Temperament even if there are few statistically significant results. The authors state “it is not the temperament that characterizes the perception of well-being.” Then they state “temperament is the aspect of personality most closely related to the perception of well-being.” Is this not contradictory? The table for Character is shown not Temperament and discussion is around Temperament. Very confusing. Why are the Character results not discussed? E.g., significant negative correlation between self-transcendence and security. This segment should include a comparison of results against the hypotheses and previous research. How do these findings compare with expected or previous findings?
6. **CONCLUSION/DISCUSSION:** This appears to be the Discussion rather than Conclusion. Please name as such. There are many elements here so please consider using sub-headings to bring more clarity as to what is being discussed and where. Rather old literature is being referenced (e.g., 1957, 2006, 2007). Please see if more recent relevant findings are available. This applies even in the Introduction segment.
7. **IMPLICATIONS:** What are managerial and academic implications of this work? Please include a section. The “so what” of the findings. Possibly a place to reiterate any novelty.
8. **LIMITATIONS, FUTURE RESEARCH SCOPE, CONCLUSION:** Small sample size and other limitations (gender, etc.) may be called out here. Future research scope as in how this work can be extended or trigger new thoughts. And then a final takeaway.