

Review of: "A Cross-sectional Survey of Public and Private Cancer Care in Nigeria and Romania"

Tomas Müllern¹

¹ Jönköping University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article draft is essentially a patient's quality perception study at two hospitals/centers, one in Nigeria and one in Romania. The idea with the paper seems to be to draw conclusions about perceived quality based on the ownership structure of the hospital (private/public). Although the overall idea is interesting - is there a significant difference between public and private ownership when it comes to patient's quality perceptions - I find the execution of the study lacking in a number of respects.

First, it is hard to draw any clear conclusions based on a sample of only one hospital in each category. Even if the sample was chosen (which it is not, btw) to provide a controlled comparison (reducing factors that could explain variations), it would still be virtually impossible to generalize the findings beyond the two hospitals.

Second, the article does not pay adequate attention to institutional conditions and differences. For instance, between the Nigerian and Romanian context. Healthcare systems are formed by specific conditions in different countries which makes comparisons notoriously hard to make.

Third, the purpose of the study is not adequately expressed and argued for. The scientific contribution is not clearly spelled out which makes it very hard to evaluate the study and whether it has fulfilled its stated purpose.

Fourth, the review of existing research on the topic is not complete. In the introduction the authors share a handful of references, but it is not very systematic and they miss a number of important studies that would have been relevant to cover. This makes it hard to see how they contribute to a stream of research.

Fifth, the paper lacks in conceptual clarity. There are a number of concepts that are not properly defined and discussed. For instance, the concept of quality/perceived quality is not explained (and furthermore, the selection of questions for the survey do not seem to be based on existing scales that measure quality in a valid way). The definition of private and public ownership is also lacking. Recent research suggests, for instance, that there are various forms of private ownership which is not discussed in the paper.

Finally, the survey is very simplistic and consists only of descriptive statistics (calculating mean values), without accounting for variation. This makes it hard to interpret the findings.

Altogether, based on the points made above, I would NOT recommend publishing this article.

