

Review of: "Road Safety Perceptions and Practices among Undergraduate Medical Students"

Firanbon Teshome

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer's comments

Abstract

1. In the background section, the authors stated the existence of strong evidence of the gap between the knowledge and the practices of road safety. If the existence of gaps between knowledge and practice is well known, the authors do not need to repeat the already studied area, rather they had to conduct implementation research on how to reduce the gaps between knowledge and practice. Thus, the background doesn't rely on the research question/objectives.
2. The title of the research and the objective are unrelated. Perception is different from knowledge and attitude. Thus, the title of the research needs to be modified
3. Materials and Methods: Authors should shortly explain the type of analyses conducted.
4. Results: mean and standard deviation need to be appropriately written (20.7 ± 4.5 years)

Introduction

1. The introduction is unable to explain the clear gaps which answer why the authors want to study knowledge, attitude, and practice of road safety. What is new in the current study? Why the study was among students in general and medical students in particular?
2. Perceptions and practices change with the individual's level of literacy.....This needs revision and citation.
3. The attitudes and practices of healthcare givers affect the behaviors of the general population.....This needs revision. The attitude and behavior of students especially health students have a great impact on the behaviors of the general population.

Methods and Materials

1. over a period 1 month (November 2021). Please write the exact date and month of the study period.
2. Why purposive sampling technique is preferred? Is that possible to generalize this finding to medical students? Why not probability sampling techniques such as a systematic sampling technique?
3. Why online questionnaire was preferred? How do the authors explain online data collection versus data quality and response rate?
4. How knowledge, attitude and practice were measured?

5. Good to carry out stronger inferential statistical analysis (e.g logistic regression) than Chi-square?

Observation

1. Do the authors explain nearly 60% non-response rate?
2. Nearly half (45%) of the respondents were 2nd year students which was due to purposive sampling techniques. Thus, the study lost internal and external validity due to its systemic and random bias.
3. Table 3: The items used to measure knowledge, attitude, and practice lacks face and content validity.

Discussion

1. The discussion lacks both theoretical and empirical discussions
2. The limitations of the study was not appreciated in this section.