



Paper: “Exploring Prevalence and Implications of Burnout Among Nurse Practitioners in Canada”

Submitted: 02 January 2025

Accepted: 06 March 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author: Roberta Heale

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n9p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Georgios Farantos
University of West Attica, Greece

Reviewer 2: Rozeta Shahinaj
Medical University of Tirana, Albania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Georgios Farantos	
University/Country: University of West Attica, Greece	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/02/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/02/2024
Manuscript Title: Exploring Prevalence and Implications of Burnout Among Nurse Practitioners in Canada	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0131/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
------------------	----------------------

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	1
<i>There is no abstract. It describes at length the phenomenon being analysed. The abstract must follow a layout, in separate sentences to describe the objects, methods, and results</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>there are no spelling or grammatical errors in the text</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>The methodology is confusing.</i> <i>The literature references on which the development of the questionnaire is based are required.</i> <i>The reported approvals indicate an unknown approval code.</i> <i>Insufficient methodological reference to statistical methods.</i> <i>The methodology of the statistical methods should be rewritten.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Only two tables are presented, which are not sufficient and no graphs are presented at all.</i> <i>The results are not sufficiently visualised.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Indicate space for research in the future.</i> <i>Indicate the social impact of research.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Bibliographic references in cite are written in the wrong way.</i> <i>All bibliographic references should follow the same style.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There is no abstract. It describes at length the phenomenon being analysed.

The abstract must follow a layout, in separate sentences to describe the objects, methods, and results.

The introduction part describes more economic problems of nurses than burnout factors.

The methodology is confusing.

The literature references on which the development of the questionnaire is based are required.

The reported approvals indicate an unknown approval code.

Insufficient methodological reference to statistical methods.

The methodology of the statistical methods should be rewritten.

Only two tables are presented, which are not sufficient and no graphs are presented at all.

The results are not sufficiently visualised.

Indicate space for research in the future.

Indicate the social impact of research.

Bibliographic references in cite are written in the wrong way.

All bibliographic references should follow the same style.

Return for major revision and resubmission

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Rozeta Shahinaj	
University/Country: Medical University of Tirana, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 12.02.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.02.2025
Manuscript Title: Exploring Prevalence and Implications of Burnout Among Nurse Practitioners in Canada	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0131	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title is clear and accurately reflects the content of the article.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	0
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The article is missing an abstract summarizing its key points.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
This article has a few grammatical and spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The methods section is appropriate and well-organized, outlining a clear process for survey development, validation, and data analysis.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The study explores various factors influencing nurse practitioner (NP) burnout, finding significant associations between burnout and workplace factors such as colleague burnout, workload expectations, and organizational support. There are no calculating errors at all.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusion is strong and summarizes the paper well.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The references are mostly well-organized and follow APA style but need some corrections about web sources, legislative references, and the unpublished manuscript.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Here are a few Suggestions to the Author:

The abstract of article is missing summarizing introduction, methods, results and conclusions.

The introduction could be expanded to include more detailed information about how gender roles and expectations affect NPs' work environments and experiences of burnout, especially given the high proportion of female workers in this field.

The methods section is thorough and well-organized, outlining a clear process for survey development, validation, and data analysis. It would be beneficial to include a brief summary of the psychometric evaluation to improve transparency for the readers.

Overall, the article requires minor revisions regarding some grammar and spelling mistakes.

