

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Relationship between effort–reward imbalance, over–commitment and occupational burnout in the general population: A prospective cohort study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Elena Lisá

Submitted on: 02 Jun 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606160

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The article brings very stimulating findings regarding the relationship between ERI, over–commitment, and burnout associated with several confounders. These results are all the more interesting because the study was conducted in a longitudinal design, with a time gap of 4 years. ERI and over–commitment do not cause burnout in light of other variables.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

To the study's limits, it is a relatively flat discussion based only on describing the results. There needs to be more interpretation of the results and pointing out their benefits. Specifically, there needs to be more interpretation and comparison regarding the cross–sectional vs. longitudinal approach. Description and interpretation of connections with confounders need to be included. Practical implications still need to be included. Discussion in terms of ERI and over–commitment in relation to burnout needs to be included. The study concludes that work effort does not damage mental health (in the sense of burnout). However, the authors did not interpret the result in that sense.

The study's strengths include examining predictive relationships in a time-lagged longitudinal design. Another benefit lies in capturing confounders. The research sample selection process is impressive. The research study is a part of the national project. The topic of burnout related to the ERI and over–commitment is interesting and useful for the practice.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

To increase the quality of the study, we recommend the following suggestions:

The study's title needs to be completed regarding the conducted data analysis. Over–commitment needs to be included there.

Work stress is included in the keywords but was not measured in the study. It shouldn't be there.

INTRODUCTION

On page 2 authors write: "Although burnout is often described a response to chronic work stressors, it is distinct from work stress." Please describe the differences and the definition of work stress.

Please add the hypotheses to the aims of the study. The research hypotheses are missing.

You write on page 3: „test the 38 potentially confounding effects of variables, rigorously identified in the published literature. „ – Which literature? Please state the concrete confounding effects and add the resources to them.

METHODS

Please add the description of the research sample. You provided only the selection process description, but the research sample description is missing in Chapter 2.1.

Please add Table 1 to Chapter 2.1.

Please add T1 and T2 marks to Figure 1.

You write: "Participants received the self-administered questionnaire during the psychiatric assessment. Two 78 reminders were sent if they did not return the questionnaire." This should be in the research sample description chapter.

Your research sample consisted of psychiatric patients. This fact should be emphasized and discussed. How can the research sample of psychiatric patients differ from healthy working adults?

Please add the list of confounders variables at the end of the 2.2.2 Chapter.

RESULTS

Chapter 3.1 should be relocated to Chapter 2.1.

Based on the results, could we say that promotion only works against burnout in the short term, but certainly not in the long term?

Based on what indicators did you claim this (page 7)?: "...exhaustion and cynicism whereas Model 2 performance is the most preferable for professional efficacy (Table 2)." I don't think it is right. Based on AIC indicators I suggest: "...exhaustion and Model 2 performance is the most preferable for exhaustion (Table 2)." Page 7, line 154 "Higher scores...." - Why did you analyze the relationship between burnout T1 and burnout T2? I don't think this intention follows either from the title or the research objectives. It would be good to remove it or to add hypotheses to the research.

When you add the relationship between burnout T1 and T2, please, add the interpretation of this result in the discussion, not only on the descriptive but also on the interpretative level. This comment also applies to lines 170-173 on page 8.

DISCUSSION

Please add the interpretation of the results in the sense of longitudinal research design. What are the empirical and practical implications of the cross-sectional and longitudinal design results, with and without the confounders? The longitudinal design is one of the contributions of your manuscript. It is necessary to interpret the results by emphasizing them in the light of the longitudinal approach and comparing them with cross-sectional results.

With longitudinal research, can you interpret the results in the sense of causality? Please describe more the idea of the causality of your research results. What are the interpretive advantages of a longitudinal research design?

The authors in the article, especially in the discussion, confuse the terms ERI and over-commitment with the term work stress. However, ERI and over-commitment are not defined as stress, only related to stress. This must be edited because the authors did not measure work stress and cannot refer to it in the discussion.

Please do not replace the work stress with ERI and over-commitment in the discussion. "Thus, our study adds valuable information on the relationship between work stress and occupational burnout in the working population of Lausanne." - You did not measure the work stress. Thus, it is not a valid statement.

„The results of this study underline the need for future studies focused on younger workers and targeted interventions to reduce occupational burnout.“ - Please explain the idea more. Why? Add some resources.

What are the practical implications of the results? Please, add the sub-chapter "Practical implications".

Please, explain the ERI and over-commitment in connection to the confounders you measured. Maybe it will be suitable also for the introductory part.

Please describe the results in connection to the research sample of psychiatric patients compared to healthy working adults.

The conclusion should sum up the idea that ERI and over-commitment do not cause burnout in light of other variables (to name).

TABLES, FIGURES

Please add the Table with zero-order correlations among analyzed variables, T1-T1, T1-T2.

Figure 2 - please add marks of T1 and T2 into the schema.

OTHER COMMENTS

Please, include the number of the Ethical committee agreement.

Burnout was lower in T1 than in T2. Did you analyze the difference? Could you provide information about the difference, please? If the difference was significant, can you mention it in the discussion and try to explain it?

I wish you well in improving your article.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

No.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

No.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.