

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59475

Title: The Ergonomics of Conflict in Healthcare: An HRM Framework for Understanding and Preventing Workplace Violence against Medical Professionals

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-002

Detailed Reviewer's Report

- Originality and research contribution
- The integration of ergonomics and HRM provides a potentially valuable perspective on workplace violence in healthcare. However, the manuscript needs to distinguish its contribution more clearly from existing research on occupational safety, workplace violence and employee well-being. The authors should explain what is genuinely new about the proposed framework and how it advances existing theories or models.
- Literature review and theoretical foundation
- The literature review requires greater depth and a more systematic structure. The authors should include relevant peer-reviewed studies on healthcare workplace violence, ergonomics, occupational stress, organisational support, conflict escalation and employee retention. Key theoretical concepts should be explicitly defined and linked to the proposed framework.
- Research methodology and case selection
- The manuscript describes an exploratory qualitative multiple-case study based on secondary media reports. However, it does not provide sufficiently reproducible details about the search strategy, sources searched, period covered, keywords, number of reports screened, inclusion and exclusion criteria, or final number of cases. These details should be reported clearly so that readers can assess the credibility of the research process.
- Evidence and data verification
- Several numerical findings and case descriptions are presented, including reported workplace-violence prevalence figures. The authors should provide complete and verifiable references for every statistic and incident, including publication details and accessible sources where available. Media reports should be distinguished from peer-reviewed empirical studies, and conflicting accounts should be handled transparently.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Analytical depth and interpretation
- The case discussions identify potentially relevant factors such as workload, waiting time, communication gaps, staffing shortages and security arrangements. However, much of the analysis remains descriptive or conceptual. The authors should present a systematic cross-case comparison showing which factors are supported by each case, which are interpretations, and where evidence is insufficient to draw conclusions.
- Conceptual framework and terminology
- The manuscript includes several related frameworks, including conflict-escalation pathways, an integrated ergonomics–HRM model and a Blue Ocean–Red Ocean perspective. These should be consolidated into one clear, logically structured framework. The authors should define the principal constructs, explain their relationships and distinguish conceptual propositions from relationships established by the reviewed evidence.
- Causal claims and balance of interpretation
- The manuscript appropriately acknowledges that its secondary-data design cannot establish definitive causality. This caution should be applied consistently throughout the paper. Workplace stressors and communication problems may contribute to conflict in some circumstances, but they should not be presented as sufficient explanations for violence or as shifting responsibility away from perpetrators. The discussion should distinguish contextual risk factors from individual responsibility.
- Practical HRM recommendations
- The recommendations concerning staffing, duty schedules, security, communication, counselling and incident reporting are relevant. However, they should be linked directly to the findings and prioritised according to feasibility and organisational responsibility. The authors should also suggest measurable indicators, such as incident-reporting rates, response times, staff perceptions of safety, training completion and employee retention, to support future evaluation.
- Organisation, repetition and academic writing
- Several sections repeat similar arguments about workplace insecurity, night duty, psychological well-being, intellectual capital and preventive intervention. The manuscript would benefit from substantial editing to reduce repetition and improve the flow between the introduction, research gap, methodology, findings, discussion and conclusion. Grammar, punctuation, spacing, heading styles, figure labels and table formatting should also be standardised.
- References, limitations and conclusion
- The reference list should be checked for completeness, accuracy and consistency with in-text citations. The authors should ensure that all cited studies and media reports can be identified and verified. The limitations section should discuss media-selection bias, incomplete reporting, lack of primary data and limited generalisability. The conclusion should summarise the principal contribution without introducing unsupported claims or repeating the entire manuscript.