

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Psychological Safety as an Enduring Resource Amid Constraints

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Elena Lisá

Submitted on: 16 Apr 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607332

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The article presents unique and interesting results from a longitudinal study representative of the selected healthcare system's population of healthcare workers. Psychological safety is a popular worldwide topic, especially for healthcare teams. We appreciate the well-justified research hypotheses, the use of hierarchical regression analysis to address intergroup differences, and the modification of the psychological safety questionnaire to accurately reflect the working environment of healthcare workers.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Despite the high quality and topicality of the article, we offer a few suggestions for improvement.

1. The "New contributions" text is more suitable for the Discussion. Consider relocating this section to the discussion part of the document and labeling it, for example, "The contributions."
2. Please add information on how the data was collected, whether it was anonymous, or whether it was possible to assign the data to a specific employee name. On what basis did you merge 2019 and 2021 data? Did participants agree with using data for research? Did an ethical committee or other institutions agree on the data collection?
3. The dependent variables were measured as ordinal variables. However, a condition of regression analysis is that the dependent variable should be interval/continuous. Authors should comment on this within the study's limitations.
4. How do you know a single question can describe workers' burnout? Can you give examples of when burnout was measured with only one question?
5. Please add a table with zero-order correlations.
6. The authors used regression analyses to examine the relationship between predictors measured in 2019 and 2021 and the same dependent variables. However, the discussion section did not address the differences between the results obtained from these two analyses. Therefore, it may be more appropriate to use the predictor variable measured in 2019. Authors can avoid issues with cross-correlation design when making predictions (2021 and 2021).
7. Please remove the rows for moderation (interactions) from Table 3.
8. Please add the slope analysis (the conditional effects - to Table 4), which will help better understand the nature of the significant moderation analysis model.
9. Please, describe and explain the significant effects of demographic variables in the results.
10. In the text, occasional references are given as name and year instead of number (e.g., Bandura ... 1977; Edmondson, 1999). Please unite the links to the references in the form of numbers.
11. In the Discussion, please add the interpretation for the non-significant results (psych safety x adequate staffing).
12. Please add the "Practical implications" section and "Future research implications."

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.

As suggested in Q2.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, it is

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes, they are.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, it is.

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?)

OK

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:

Minor revisions.