

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Intolerance of uncertainty, job satisfaction and work performance in Turkish healthcare professionals: mediating role of psychological capital

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Milena Trifunovic-Koenig

Submitted on: 23 Apr 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607127

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The cross-sectional study aimed to detect correlations between various constructs within organizational psychology, such as job satisfaction, subjective work performance, job uncertainty (intolerance), and psychological and social resources (Psychological Capital), in Turkey during the pandemic. The most significant finding, in my opinion, is that job uncertainty could predict job satisfaction and work performance. A complex mediational model involving Psychological Capital as a mediator in these relationships was proposed.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The strength of the study lies in data collection during the pandemic and the relatively large sample size and apparently the validity of the methods employed. However, the rationale for the conduction of the study is lacking, particularly concerning the assumption of causality in a cross-sectional design. What sets this study apart is the introduction of a novel mediational model for which the justification is missing. Furthermore, practical implications are notably absent from the discussion.

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.

Dear authors,

Thank you for entrusting me with the opportunity to review your manuscript. Your ambition in addressing multiple concepts simultaneously and conducting a mediational analysis is commendable. However, I find several shortcomings in the paper that need attention to ensure clarity and definitiveness in your statements, thereby enhancing impact. Allow me to address various points below, ranging from larger to smaller concerns:

- The essence of mediational analyses is to provide insights into the nature of relationships between variables, including their directional influence. Hence, the inclusion of work performance and job satisfaction at the end of Figure 1 implies a directionality of causality. There are indeed influential statistical authorities, such as Maxwell and Cole (Maxwell SE, Cole DA. Bias in cross-sectional analyses of longitudinal mediation. *Psychol Methods*. 2007 Mar;12(1):23-44. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.12.1.23), who categorically rule out mediational analysis in cross-sectional designs. However, I diverge from their perspective and align more with Hayes, who argues that such analyses are feasible in non-longitudinal studies. Nevertheless, the rationale behind this direction is not clearly articulated. Why was this specific model chosen over others, such as moderation? Following the job demands-resources model, psychological capital could indeed act as a buffer or moderator, mitigating the negative effects of stressors like job uncertainty. Yet, the absence of a direct link between job satisfaction and job performance in the model is not very clear.
- Moreover, the novelty of the study is questionable, as there are numerous similar studies in the literature.

- While the reference to the COVID-19 pandemic is prominent in the title, it is unclear if there's been any change regarding the included variables in the literature since the onset of the pandemic.
 - Additionally, details regarding the recruitment process and sample composition are lacking. How many individuals were approached, how many responded, and was the sampling method open or closed? These missing pieces of information undermine the clarity and comprehensiveness of the study's methodology.
 - Please explain in the abstract what do psychological capital refer to?
 - Precise the relationships that were mediated by psychological capital. They were between uncertainty intolerance and job satisfaction and uncertainty intolerance and work performance.
 - avoid predictive terminology such as predictive impact, relationship, association or correlation is more appropriate for the applied design. Precise if the correlation was positive or negative.
 - "increased psychological capital" delete increased
 - The age of the participants please in M(SD) form
 - It is important to provide a rationale for why a mediator was chosen in the study. While I am not opposed to mediation being explored in a cross-sectional design as previously noted, it is crucial to offer strong justification. Additionally, we must consider what precedes the direction of correlation.
 - The hypothesis is usually stated in the present tense to reflect its current validity.
 - The recruitment process needs to be clarified.
 - When referring to Cronbach's alpha, it is essential to specify whether you mean in the current study or in the validation study.
 - You have examined skewness and kurtosis, but have you also visually inspected the plots?
 - When discussing the bivariate correlations, remember to refer to Table 1. These correlations provide important insights into the relationships between variables, so be sure to elaborate on their significance and implications.
 - Cave causality implication! Use the appropriate language.
 - Write more clearly why this study is practically important.
- I know, I have pushed you because I genuinely believe in the potential of the paper. I want to see it become a polished and impactful piece that effectively communicates its potentials. I look forward to witnessing the impact of your work once these revisions are incorporated.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The inclusion of "COVID-19 pandemic" in the title might warrant reconsideration, as its relevance to the study's focus is not clear in the current version of the manuscript. However, it is an important fact that the authors have to explain and highlight in the text, to make this title appropriate. Additionally, the use of mediation as an analytical approach in the title should be a subject of further consideration.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

I am not a native speaker, but I believe that the the English language is of good quality.

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, but consider shortening.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11 Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 12 Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.