

Review of: "Associations between ICU-days and patient experiences and perceptions of clinical research in intensive care units: a mediation analysis"

Dr. Ramesh Bhandari¹

¹ KLE College of Pharmacy

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author explored the patient experience and perceptions regarding clinical research in intensive care units in the study. However, the study has the following major issues that should be revised before publication. Additionally, I recommend that the manuscript should also undergo a statistical review by a qualified statistician.

Major Issues:

1. **Title and Objective Discrepancy:** The manuscript's title suggests that it is a study of association between ICU days' and patient experiences & perceptions, but the objectives mentioned in the abstract and background do not clearly align with this. I recommend that the authors revise the objective to better match the study's actual content.
2. **Ethical Approval and Study Registration:** As this is a clinical study, it is crucial that the authors provide evidence of obtaining ethical approval for their research. Furthermore, if the study is expected to be registered in a national registry, this should be clearly indicated. The mere assurance to participants of confidentiality and the option to withdraw is not sufficient to waive the requirement for ethical approval.
3. **Authorship and Credibility:** Only one author is mentioned in the manuscript, which raises concerns about the credibility and rigor of the study. It is important to clarify the contributions of each author, their affiliations, and the study's ethical oversight. A single author for a clinical study may not be adequate.
4. **Lack of Rationale:** The rationale behind conducting this study is not adequately explained. The authors should provide a clear justification for the need for this research and its potential significance in the background section.
5. **Missing Study Design & Setting:** The method section of the manuscript does not include information about the study design and setting. It is essential to describe the study design & setting where the research was conducted for readers to better understand the context.
6. **Questionnaire Specificity:** The manuscript mentions that questionnaires were distributed to patients, relatives, and ICU staff. However, the responses were collectively analyzed, which lacks specificity. It is essential to clarify why responses from these different groups were treated collectively and how this aligns with the research objectives.
7. **Question Validity:** The validity of the questions related to the experiences and perceptions of participants is not

adequately addressed. The authors should explicitly explain how these questions were formulated, validated, and piloted before administering them to the participants.

8. ICU Day Classification Rationale: The manuscript refers to classifying ICU days as either "0" or " ≥ 1 ," but the rationale for this classification is unclear. The authors should provide a detailed explanation for this categorization.

Minor Issue:

1. Language Quality: The manuscript displays poor English language quality. I recommend that the authors thoroughly proofread and edit the manuscript to improve its language, grammar, and clarity.