

Title was appropriate.

Abstract was clear and comprehensible

Introduction

It was too brief and I love to know more about what is known and what is unknown about the topic. I think the research objective was very broad and vague which is very difficult to be handled by a cross-section study. In fact “practice what they preach” is also very subjective that is vulnerable to multiple interpretations.

We initiated this study to see if healthcare professionals of the sixth most populous country in the world “practice what they preach”. (LINE 71-72)

I recommend for the authors to rephrase the research objective to reflect the expected outcomes.

Methodology:

What was the purpose of conducting pilot study? Why merely focus on dietary intake?

Otherwise satisfactory

Results

Table 2 – I think the authors must include the values of t-statistics/ χ^2 -statistics for each comparison made. Otherwise the report is incomplete.

Table 4 – Occupational stressor: how the authors identified the stressors because none of this was mentioned in the methodology.

Table 5 – Binary logistic regression: what was the method used (enter method, stepwise method, etc)? What was the value of χ^2 -statistics for the whole model? What was the value of Nagelkerke R^2 ? What was the value of Wald- χ^2 statistics for each variable in the model?

Overall the binary logistic regression looks okay, but the way it is presented can be improved, please see the example below:

Table 4: Factors that contributed to stress level of the medical students.

Variables	B coefficient	Wald-X ² statistics (df)	P-value*	Odd Ratio (95% CI)
Universiti				
UPM	-0.921	6.97 (1)	0.009	0.398 (0.20, 0.70)
UMS	-0.311	0.68 (1)	0.409	0.773 (0.35, 1.53)
UNIMAS	-1.000	6.97 (1)	0.008	0.368 (0.17, 0.77)
USM (reference group)		10.38 (3)	0.016	
Parent income				
RM 701 – RM 1500	1.085	4.03 (1)	0.045	2.96 (1.03, 8.54)
RM 1501 – RM 5000	0.571	1.17 (1)	0.280	1.77 (0.63, 4.99)
RM 5001 – RM 10000	1.640	7.71 (1)	0.005	5.16 (1.62, 16.42)
RM 10001 – RM 20000	2.615	11.73 (1)	0.001	13.67 (3.06, 61.10)
More than RM 20000	0.078	0.01 (1)	0.932	1.08 (0.18, 6.40)
Less than RM 700 (reference group)		19.68 (5)	0.001	
ARS group				
Causing mild to moderate stress	0.991	0.79 (1)	0.373	2.69 (0.30, 23.86)
Causing moderate to high stress	1.978	3.15 (1)	0.076	7.23 (0.81, 64.19)
Causing high to sever stress	2.789	5.70 (1)	0.017	16.27 (1.65, 160.48)
Causing nil to mild stress (reference group)		16.75 (3)	0.001	
DRS group				
Causing mild to moderate stress	0.126	0.18 (1)	0.670	1.13 (0.64, 2.02)
Causing moderate to high stress	1.290	8.16 (1)	0.004	3.63 (1.50, 8.81)
Causing high to sever stress	2.219	4.06 (1)	0.044	9.2 (1.06, 79.66)
Causing nil to mild stress (reference group)		11.42 (3)	0.010	
GARS group				
Causing mild to moderate stress	0.870	5.54 (1)	0.019	2.39 (1.16, 4.93)
Causing moderate to high stress	1.349	9.78 (1)	0.002	3.85 (1.65, 8.97)
Causing high to sever stress	1.495	3.15 (1)	0.076	4.46 (0.85, 23.27)
Causing nil to mild stress (reference group)		10.30 (3)	0.016	
Constant	-3.266	7.77 (1)	0.005	0.04

*Binary Logistic Regression test, p-value less than 0.05 was considered as significance at 95% Confident Interval.

Discussion

Overall the authors able to compare this study findings with previous studies. They also described about the limitations of this study – perhaps the non-probability sampling method could be added as another limitation.

Citation and reference

- I noted several references were not cited according to the journal format e.g.:

“They are more susceptible to stress and its 57 negative consequences than general population (Willcock et al., 2004),(P, DAVIDSON & N,58 2004)”. (LINE 56-58)

Overall

An interesting article that is publishable, but several amendments would help to improve the quality of this article.