

# Review of: "Design of an Educational Campaign Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior to Encourage People to Donate Organs: A Study Protocol"

Jacopo Fiorini<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Policlinico Tor Vergata

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a protocol of unknown study design that has a wrong aim based on the development of the educational program and not on the rate of organ donation adhesion. Besides, there are many methodological flaws that negatively affect the protocol. Many aspects of this protocol are unclear or in development, such as the instrument creation and validation, or how to measure the effect of the program.

The title must be more informative; for example, "Enhancing Organ Donations: An Educational Study Protocol Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour."

## Abstract

Avoid referring to yourself.

The design of this study is not declared.

The Equator checklist is not declared.

The registration of this study is not reported.

The questionnaires should be instruments already validated and not created by you.

In the introduction, you have used similar references to Sadegni et al. without guaranteeing a real condition on an international level.

There are references in Vancouver style, see 12, 10.

In the introduction, there are no references and discussions about interventions related to improving organ donations. Besides, it is not clear why a sample educational program is more effective than other interventions. For example, you have not cited the implementation of transplant nurses; these are evidence-based interventions that improve the rate of organ donations.

## Methods

What do you mean by "interventional study"? Will this be a clinical trial?

The aim is wrong. You want "to improve the rate of organ donations or adhesion to organ donation declarations." The educational program is not the aim but the methodology.

Knowledge is a banal outcome.

You should declare "primary outcome" and "secondary outcomes."

How do you measure the culture of organ donations?

The research hypothesis is one and not the number of the aims. Besides, it is not clear about the temporal evaluation of this intervention (3/6/9/12 months).

"Trained executive teams" is generic. You must be clear and report their training and specify their specialization.

It is not clear how you approach and enroll participants or what they do for training.

The logo is not useful for clinical trials and publications.

The technique of sampling and randomizing is not clear and does not report the randomization process.

The questionnaire about the knowledge of organ donation must be validated before the conduction of this research, basing on the literature review. The CVI is a simple and starting phase of the instrument validation. You should perform a CFA and EFA. The process of instrument validation is another publication. You should have already validated the instrument when you published this protocol.

The topic of the educational materials is not declared, and the contents must be declared in the protocol.

In the outcomes measures, there is the response rate of the "future" instruments, and there are samples of questions that are not supported by references or a literature review.

The sample size is estimated based on the rate of organ donations, but there is no reference on how you stratified the sample by participant types.

Data analysis does not report how you analyzed the primary outcomes before and after the intervention, considering the lack of the developed instrument.

References are limited to local conditions and not focused on the international level.