

Peer Review Report

Review Report on The European Researchers' Network Working on Second Victim (ERNST) Policy Statement on the second victim phenomenon for increasing patient safety

Policy Brief, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Rinat Cohen

Submitted on: 07 Aug 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1607175

EVALUATION

Q 1 What are the main findings and conclusions reported in this manuscript?

Patient safety remains a critical challenge in healthcare, despite concerted efforts. Adverse events (AEs) not only harm patients but also inflict significant psychological and emotional distress on healthcare providers, known as the "second victim" phenomenon.

While substantial research focuses on patient outcomes and safety improvements, the impact of AEs on healthcare professionals is often overlooked. This phenomenon can lead to burnout, decreased job satisfaction, and even medical errors, creating a vicious cycle that compromises patient care.

This manuscript underscores the urgent need to address the second victim phenomenon as an integral component of patient safety. By examining the psychological, organizational, and systemic factors contributing to this issue, they aim to develop comprehensive strategies to support healthcare providers and enhance overall patient care.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and advantages.

The "second victim" phenomenon negatively impacts patient care quality and safety.
Addressing the second victim is crucial for improving overall patient safety.
Peer support is a key strategy for mitigating the emotional impact on healthcare professionals.
Systemic changes, such as promoting a just culture and rethinking legal frameworks, are essential.
The text proposes the following actions:
Increase awareness of the second victim phenomenon.
Implement peer support programs.
Promote a just culture within healthcare organizations.
Re-evaluate legal frameworks to support healthcare professionals.
By addressing the needs of healthcare professionals, the text argues that it is possible to create a safer environment for both patients and staff.

Q 3 Are there objective errors or fundamental flaws? If yes, please detail your concerns.

Based on the review of the text, there are no objective errors or fundamental flaws in the document.

The text appears to be well-structured and presents a clear argument about the importance of addressing the second victim phenomenon in healthcare.

Here are some strengths of the text:

Clearly defines the concept of the second victim phenomenon
Highlights the negative impact on healthcare professionals and patient safety
Offers a range of solutions to address the issue

Q 4 Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Does the manuscript provide an appropriate context for a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Does the manuscript use language that can be understood by a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Is the quality of figures and/or tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Is the evidence presented appropriate, sound and objective?

Yes.

Are the action points provided based on the evidence?

Yes.

Are the action points provided reasonable and feasible?

Yes.

Are there any ethical issues with the recommendations provided?

Yes.

Q 5 Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

Overall, the text effectively conveys its message and provides valuable insights for improving patient safety in healthcare settings.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 6 Originality



Q 7 Rigor



Q 8 Significance to the field



Q 9 Interest to a general audience



Q 10 Quality of the writing



Q 11 Overall quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 12 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Accept.