

Review of: "Medical Profession in Nigeria Since 1960"

Shakeerah Olaide Gbadebo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

The manuscript was a good read, giving a lot of information on corruption in the medical field in Nigeria. This is one area that I agree should be explored, and solutions should be proffered. Also, I must commend the researchers for conducting this research in 16 states in Nigeria for a period of 2012 to 2018, with follow-up research between 2020 and 2022 without a specific research sponsorship!!!(as declared by the authors)

However, this manuscript has many flaws.

1. The title does not reflect the aim of the study. "Medical Profession since 1960" sounds like a narrative review, but it is reporting a study using a mixed methods design to assess corruption in the medical field and the effect of the media in curbing the corruption!!! This does not tally with the title.
2. Introduction and review were quite informative but made the manuscript look like it was a review article.
3. The Methodology was not very explicit.

The study design was not well explained. The study was claimed to be a cross-sectional survey, and a follow-up was done between 2020 and 2022 (according to the abstract), follow-up on what?!!!!

What type of interview was done? A focus group or an in-depth individual interview? How were the interviews conducted?

The sample size calculation was done with an online calculator. Such as?

A sample of 185 was mentioned in the methodology, but the results showed two sets of samples/data (those that were given the questionnaire 117 respondents and those interviewed 268!!!) The qualitative interview of 268 people?!!!

The details of the analysis for both qualitative and quantitative data were lacking in the manuscript.

4. Results: Why were quotes from the qualitative report cited? See citations [37] and [38].

Nothing was mentioned about the 2020-2022 follow-up.

5. Conclusion: This should clearly reflect the results of the study presented, but the authors failed to do this.

6. Footnotes and Referencing were confusing. What is the difference between the footnotes and the references?

