

Review of: "Controlling Offenses on Health Care Personnel through Environmental Design of Healthcare Environments"

Abigail Affiong Mkperedem¹

¹ Landmark University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Point 1: First of all, let me congratulate the author on a very interesting study. This is an important study, but it is in need of a major revision before it is suitable for publication. The author's need to consider the following :

Firstly, there is a lack of clarity in terms of the context in which these frameworks are being applied. Study location is unclear and this could limit the applicability and generalization of the frameworks.

Second, the structure of the article should be changed and reorganized.

Point 2: This article would be significantly improved by a revision of the abstract, as well as a more complete and structured literature review and discussion of the study's contribution to the field.

The article should have a review of literature and a discussion more related to the activity, more structured, in order to justify the methodological choices and to show the contribution of the study.

Point 3: Improve your background to include current state of assaults on doctors globally and in the study location (please show more recent and relevant statistics from previous scholars); how this impacted or led to environmental design of healthcare environment to control offenses on health care personnel. This will guide your statement of problem.

In the introduction, please double check that the sentences are fluent and explain better the background of the situation in the country.

Point 4: The method section of your manuscript should be reorganized and presented in more detail in sub-sections including setting, sampling and sample size, data collection method, data analysis, and ethical considerations. The data collection process should be described: where, how? Findings and discussion should be enriched.

Please describe in detail the methodology used, step by step, right now it's quite generic, it needs to be implemented. Please compare studies better in discussion.

The Method section lacks critical information. Describe;

(1) on what basis the hospitals were selected (2) the procedures used to recruit participants (from what list were they selected and how were they contacted?).

(3) Please state the sampling method used in this study as it may affect the validity and generalizability of the findings.

- (4). The authors fail to address matters of sample and data quality.
- (5). With respect to the former, the authors should provide response rates by describing the number approached and the number participating in the interview.
- (6). Further, evidence that their data represents that of their population should be provided.. iv. Regarding the latter, no discussion is made of missing data, which virtually all such surveys have.
- (7). The discussion section is lacking in this article
- (8) Strengths, limitations and future research prospect sections should be considered relevant sections.
- (9) In addition to the usual, the authors should note that their analysis ignore the expected misestimation of variance arising from the sampling of clusters (hospitals), which give rise to understated variances and in turn an inflated rate of false negative conclusions. With regard to point 2, research can be furthered by using multilevel methods to separate the effects of healthcare centers from that of respondents.

Point 5: What are the characteristics, qualifications, experience and training of the researcher/facilitator who conducted the interviews?

- (2) How long did the interview last? What kind of interview was conducted (KII, IDI, FGDs)?
- (3) Were transcripts returned to participants for comments and/or corrections?
- (4) Provide a more in-depth understanding of the qualitative analysis?

Point 6: Study limitations should be included to reinforce the strong limitations regarding the external validity of the study.

Point 7: Use new references. In this field, many new articles have been published.

Point 8: Some past researchers have been studied the issues. Comparing the previous studies, what is major implication for academicians and enterprisers? This should be discussed in discussion and implications section. I recommend acceptance with major revisions.

Point 9: Once again, thank you for the opportunity to review your article, on an interesting topic, but the article would be significantly improved by a revision of the abstract, keywords, as well as a more complete and structured literature review and discussion of the study's contribution to the field.