EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"Job Redesign as a Strategy to Reduce Burnout Among Nurses: A Theoretical Perspective"**

Submitted: 24 September 2025
Accepted: 13 November 2025
Published: 30 November 2025

Corresponding Author: Moses Siruri Marwa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n32p71

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mary Hollingsworth
Liberty University, USA

Reviewer 2: Magy Martin
Department of Psychology, Walden University, Minneapolis, USA

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Dr. Mary Ann Hollingsworth	
University/Country: Liberty University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: October 8, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: October 12, 2025
Manuscript Title: Burnout in Nurses: How Job Redesigns Can Help.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 27.10.2025	
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.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**2**
The abstract presents objects of the study, but no methodology or results are presented.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**2**
Quite a few errors are present in APA format such as correct format on citations, lack of correct capitalization of words in headings, some spelling errors, and some errors in APA formatting on the reference list.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
The paper provides review and overview of burnout and some theories or practices to address it. No methods of study are presented.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**2**
The conclusion section provides some discussion of what authors concluded as insight from their meta-analysis. The lack of a clear methodology set the stage for poor results to be discussed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusion does mirror what was shared in the paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
This list is comprehensive and seems to fit the focus of the manuscript well.	

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): The paper provides some good background information that could be used for a study on this topic with clearly designed methodology for a meta-analysis of burnout and nurses. To have further consideration for publication with the journal, revision is needed to state a clear research question and present methodology to answer that, then discussion of the conduct of the methodology and results that were obtained. This could still be provided for conduct of a meta-analysis.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Return to authors with request that they revise the paper to meet the above suggestions.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 08-10-2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 15-10-2025
Manuscript Title: Burnout in Nurses: How Job Redesigns Can Help	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **1027/25**	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **No**	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: **No** 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.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
The title is clear and appropriate to the content of the article. However, it is rather short. I recommend adding "Literature Review" at the end to make it more precise.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4**
The abstract clearly outlines the study objectives, provides an overview of the literature review, and presents the main results.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
The article contains a few of grammatical and spelling errors. A few examples are provided below: • The term burnout with reference to an organizational context ("in an organizational context" sounds more natural) • …..is the one credited to have refined (should be "credited with refining")	

• …..and having children have also been argued as to contribute (should be "to contribute" or "as contributing") • The highlighted job dimensions have been explored as causal variables to burn out (should be "of burnout")	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
A methodology section is not included, which is appropriate given the article's nature as a literature review.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The results are clearly and accurately presented, bringing together insights from the theoretical framework and literature review to highlight a number of relevant empirical studies on the topic.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusions are precise and well aligned with the content of the article.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
The references are thorough and relevant. Their formatting is well structured and adheres to APA standards as well as the specific requirements of the journal.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear, but it is too general and informal for a scholarly article. It does not reflect the paper's theoretical focus or specific interventions.
Suggestion: Revise to a more academic and precise form, such as "Job Redesign as a Strategy to Reduce Burnout Among Nurses: A Theoretical Perspective".
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
No, the abstract does not clearly present the objectives, methods, and results.

It identifies the problem (nurse burnout) and mentions job redesign as a potential solution, but it lacks:

Objectives: The purpose or specific aims of the paper are vague.

Methods: There is no description of the paper type (conceptual/theoretical review) or how sources were analyzed.

Results: No clear outcomes, propositions, or conclusions are stated.

Suggestion: Rewrite the abstract to include these elements—
Purpose: to explore how job redesign strategies can mitigate nurse burnout;
Method: conceptual analysis of job design theories;
Results: job enrichment and job crafting identified as promising interventions.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Yes, there are minor grammatical and stylistic errors throughout the article, though overall readability is good. The issues are not severe but need correction before publication.

Suggestion: Conduct a final language and APA-style edit to ensure consistency in terminology, grammar, and reference formatting. The errors are minor but sufficient to affect professional presentation in a journal like ESJ.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
No, the study methods are not explained clearly.

The article discusses relevant theories and conceptual arguments but does not specify a straightforward methodological approach. There is no section describing how information was gathered, how sources were selected, or what analytical framework was used. For a conceptual or theoretical paper, ESJ expects authors to clearly specify the type of study (e.g., literature review, conceptual analysis, theoretical synthesis) and outline the methodology used for analysis.

Suggestion:

Add a brief “Methodology” or “Approach” section in the introduction, for example:

This paper adopts a conceptual review approach, synthesizing existing literature on job design theories and burnout in nursing to propose a theoretical framework for future empirical testing.

This addition would make the study design explicit and align with academic publication standards.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is generally clear and logically organized, but it does contain minor issues that should be corrected before publication.

Suggestion:

Revise for conciseness, consistency, and APA formatting, ensuring that all figures and tables appear properly labeled. The content is conceptually strong, but a careful technical and language edit is required for publication readiness.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes — the conclusion is accurate and supported by the content, but it remains too brief and general for journal publication standards.

Suggestion:

Expand the conclusion to include three concise elements:

Summary of key theoretical insights (e.g., how job enrichment and job crafting mitigate burnout).

Practical implications (e.g., HR and organizational development applications).

Future research direction (e.g., empirical testing of the proposed framework).

This will make the conclusion more robust, accurate, and publication-ready.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes — the reference list is generally comprehensive and appropriate, but it requires technical and formatting improvements to meet European Scientific Journal and APA 7th edition standards.

Suggestion

Conduct a full APA 7th style audit for capitalization, italics, punctuation, and DOIs.

Ensure every in-text citation corresponds to a reference entry and vice versa.

Retain at least 70–80% of current references, but update any outdated or inconsistent citations.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The paper presents a relevant and well-structured discussion on how job redesign can address nurse burnout, supported by extensive and current literature. However, it requires refinement to meet the standards of publication. The abstract should clearly state the objectives, method, and results. A brief methodology section is necessary to identify the paper as either a conceptual or theoretical review. The title should be more formal and precise, and the conclusion should expand to include practical implications and directions for future research. Finally, ensure consistency in terminology, correct minor grammatical issues, and standardize references in full APA 7th edition format.
