editage®
by CACTUS

📄 **Acknowledge editing support**

☺ Let us help you

➢ Respond to editor comments or send your questions to the editor
➢ Get your revisions checked before paper submission
➢ Let us know if you are not satisfied with the iob

💬 Help us know you better

➢ Give feedback on the job
➢ Add the editor to your Favorite Editors list
➢ Let us know if your paper gets accepted by the journal

Scientific Editing Report

Dear Author,

This document contains an assessment of the manuscript in terms of its language and presentation, content, and submission readiness. Where relevant, I have also provided recommendations for improving the manuscript. Should you have any questions on the report, do let me know.

Best regards,
Priyanka Thali
Managing Editor

Table of Contents

LANGUAGE AND PRESENTATION
Notes from the Language Editor

Overview

This manuscript was generally written very well as submitted. Language-related edits were nearly all minor in nature, albeit needed throughout the text. Note that the citations remain to be converted to APA style; this was impossible during editing as the reference list was not part of the document.

Organization and flow

Abstract. The abstract required minimal attention. However, keywords must be added after the abstract.

Introduction. The introduction provides a clear background to the study. Again, there were few issues; the main issue was some instances of informal language, which I corrected.

Methods. The methods are suitable and allow the reader to understand what you did. You refer to "gastronomy," which does not fit in context — please see my comment in the text. "Gastronomy" usually refers to the study/consumption of fine foods, which does not appear suitable in the context of supermarket departments. An additional issue is that the role of the training session is somewhat confused by your second paragraph in the design section: you refer to the study not assessing the extent to which employees were stressed. However, it seems that this was actually what you did after the training session. You may wish to clarify here, or even remove the relevant sentence.

It is also important that you provide details of ethical approvals and the consent process.

Results. The results are clearly presented, to the extent that I could judge this as the tables were not included.

Discussion and Conclusion. These sections are rather unfocused, especially toward the end. I believe you could reduce their length considerably and not detract from the text. In particular, your limitations and strengths sections would benefit from this attention; the limitations are rather generic. You might also recognize/discuss the low prevalence of bullying, which was an outcome of the study.

Formatting
Formatting requirements (for APA style) were met, except for the citations. These could not be changed from their current numbered style as the reference list was not included in the manuscript.

CONTENT REVIEW
Notes from the Scientific Reviewer

Title, Abstract, and Keywords

Very few changes are needed here. You will need to add the necessary keywords. It is best to use the maximum number of possible keywords in order to increase the likelihood that your manuscript will be identified by search engines.

Recommendation 1. Add more contextual information to the abstract. Right now, there is a greater focus on the method and results, while there was insufficient background information to clearly explain the rationale for the study's aim. Similarly, there needs to be a conclusion that relates to be broader implications of the study.

Literature Review and Research Rationale

While the introduction reads quite clearly with appropriate language and flow, there is a lack of details to the background that makes the reader have trouble understanding the broader context and purpose of the study design. To address these issues, greater detail to contextualize and define each element of your theoretical model is needed. This is particularly crucial for explaining your theory of mediation.

Recommendation 1. **What is the purpose of understanding this model and research, other than including measures that are not primarily reliant on self-report.** Workplace bullying is an extremely timely and relevant topic of research right now. However, I think you need to expand upon how this theoretical model will benefit the larger field of study related to workplace bullying. To accomplish this, I would recommend that you clarify why this research is needed, and how it fills a relevant gap that will benefit workers and researchers.

Recommendation 2. **Consider explaining the role of workplace bullying from a supervisor to an employee versus lateral-level workplace bullying.** This is a minor point, but in your description of workplace bullying, I was unclear if you were talking about bullying amongst peers in the workplace or bullying that is directed from a

supervisor to an employee. I know that research has been done in both areas, and it is unclear if there are any differences, or how these types of relationships might matter to your definition of workplace bullying.

Recommendation 3. **Define all of your terms and constructs when you present them.** The constructs of job strain and effort-reward imbalance need to be defined and presented in your introduction so that the reader can begin to understand why you theorize that these variables should be included in your model.

Recommendation 4. **Make sure to present all paths of your theoretical model in the introduction and justify the hypothesis of mediating.** I would recommend that explain the model more clearly, as the lack of details on the role of job-related strain being a mediating variable is not clearly explained in the introduction. While it may be related to both MSDs and Workplace bullying, its mediating role (versus moderating, or simply related role) needs to be clarified. This is particularly important given your cross-sectional design. You may also consider adding a hypothesized model to the introduction.

Recommendation 5. **Is this model only relevant for workplaces that require manual labor?** The research that you discuss in your introduction that are related to MSDs and psychosocial well-being is limited to manual labor. Are you proposing a model that is only relevant for those who are working at physically demanding jobs, or you are suggesting that this model may be relevant across all fields of employment. I would recommend clarifying this in your introduction.

Study Design or Methodology

Overall, I could understand your design, but there were a few details that needed to added to be consistent with APA style as well as to provide sufficient clarity to the reader.

Recommendation 1. **Clarify the role of the workplace training and the process of recruitment.** It was unclear if all workers participated in the training, and after the training, the researchers asked the employees if they would complete the survey after attending the training, or they were recruited prior to the training, which was

part of the study. You do discuss this briefly in the Discussion, but this should be clearly explained in the participants section.

Recommendation 2. **Include psychometric information for all of your related measures to establish their reliability and validity.** Due to the requirements of APA formatting, the internal consistency for each of the measures should be presented. I would recommend that if you are including established measures, you including both the originally reported Cronbach's alpha and the alpha for your own sample.

Recommendation 3. **Justify how each confounding variable may act as a confounding variable.** You list a number of confounding variables that you opt to control for you in your model, but the reasoning behind your decision to make them confounding variables needs to be justified to the reader.

Recommendation 4. **Include details on ethical procedures and the consent process, particularly as this was related to employees who may have felt required to participate.** This is mandatory for the manuscript to be submitted to the journal. You will need to explain your consenting process, and also consider/discuss how you explained that employees would not be harmed or placed at disadvantage if they decided to refused to participate

Recommendation 5. **Explain your analytic techniques.** While it is not necessary to explain well known analytic techniques, such as logistic regression, it is important to define and clarify specific methods and techniques that may not be universally known. This is particularly true for Preacher and Hayes Method, as well as clarifying the Sobel method.

Results and Statistical Analyses

This section needs a greater level of revision compared to the rest of the manuscript. Right now, there is a good deal of information that should be moved to the Methods or the Discussion section. All details on the psychometrics, should be in the Methods, and placed in the subsections that are specific to each measure. All commentary on the results should be placed in the Discussion section.

Without the specific statistics in the Results section, and not having access to the relevant tables, it is difficult to fully understand the findings of the manuscript. Remember that the Results section should allow the reader to understand the findings without having to utilized figures and tables.

Recommendation 1. **Report your data in the results section, and move the commentary to the Discussion section.** Make sure that you are not reflecting upon your findings and what they might mean in your Results section. The Results should include only the factual reporting of information.

Recommendation 2. **Remove references to other research and comparisons to existing studies.** This is very similar to the first recommendation. I would recommend that you refrain from comparing your own results and findings from those in comparable studies in the Results. These points should be moved to the Discussion section.

Recommendation 3. **Make sure to include statistical results in your text as well as in your tables.** All relevant and key findings needed to be reported in the main text of your manuscript. The reader should be able to see the key results without having to reference the tables. (Just as tables and figures should be able to be interpreted without referencing the text.) These results should include the inferential statistical values, the *p*-value, the confidence intervals (where appropriate), and the effect sizes (where appropriate).

Recommendation 4. **How did you assess that your confounding variables were in fact, confounding variables?** I would recommend that you add more information, as well as potentially including a specific table focused on this. It seems as if your confounding variables may actually function as important covariates or moderating variables, but this is difficult to understand without the necessary statistical analyses.

Discussion and Conclusion

Overall, the details in the Discussion were relevant and interesting; however, the discussion section could be better organized and structured to help the reader understand your primary take-away points.

Recommendation 1. **Start the Discussion with a summary of your key findings.** It is helpful for the reader for you to include a 2-3 sentence summary of your key findings without the statistical values, but rather in descriptive terms. This summary helps the reader identify with the results that you determined to be most important.

Recommendation 2. **Be careful about using causal language.** Consider discussing other explanations for your model, and offering reasons why they are not appropriate. As your design is cross-sectional, as you noted in your limitations, it is possible that the directionality and patterns of association between the variables could be different. It is important to make sure that you consider and acknowledge these other explanations, and if possible, reject them.

Additionally, while you stated that no causal inferences can be made due to the study design, it is important for you to use tentative language rather than using terms that assume a directional and causal relationship.

Recommendation 3. **Clarify and discuss the generalizability of your findings.** I think that this is important as you did not necessarily include a workplace that could be viewed as being identical to all other areas of employment. For example, working in a hospital, office, or factory could lead to different patterns of findings. I would recommend that you discuss this in your limitations, and identify for whom these results may be relevant.

Recommendation 4. **Add structure and organization by including subheadings to the Discussion section.** By doing this, you would help ensure that the reader is understanding your focus and key points based on your study.

Recommendation 5. **Consider adding your confounding variables to your future directions and limitations.** I actually think that examining these confounding variables and their roles in your model is extremely interesting in its own right, and may be a relevant topic for future research. For example—does this model look different for supervisors versus employees? This would then indicate that role in the workplace is a moderating influence, rather than a confounding variable.

SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

Journal Scope

Section	Assessment	Comments
The paper can be submitted to the target journal	Yes	I do believe that the paper fits the aims and scope of the target journal; however, I do have concerns that the design (i.e., cross-sectional, self-report data) will meet the rigors of this journal.
The study conforms to relevant ethical standards	No	Right now there are insufficient details to be able to evaluate this point

Journal Requirements

Section	Assessment	Comments
The title page contains the title and all author information, including the complete contact details of the corresponding author.	Yes	The submitted title page must be blinded, as it is in the text. A separate, full title page must be provided during submission.
The paper is in the format preferred by the journal (MS Word, PDF, TeX).	Yes	
All figures and tables have been prepared in the correct format and in keeping with the journal's requirements.	NA	These items were not provided in the document.
In-text citations and references correspond to each other and are accurate.	NA	Only citation numbers were listed, and therefore could not be checked.

	Yes	Citations are present where one would expect citations, although the citations themselves could not be assessed, for the aforementioned reasons.
Citations have been provided where necessary.		
A cover letter has been included with the manuscript.	Yes	I generated an appropriate cover letter.