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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports on a study that aims to look at whether various sociodemographic and occupational factors are related to burnout experience. General opinion is that author(s) ha(s)ve clearly recognized that burnout needed to be researched from a clinical point of view. And author(s) also should be commended with recruiting such a large sample. This said, I am concerned about a number of issues. I first describe my major concerns, before addressing more minor ones. I hope that my comments will be helpful to you.

Major concerns

1. My main concern primarily relate to the choice of the study variables, and hence to the contribution of the study. Author(s) state(s) that a primary aim is to contribute to the rather limited number of studies that have examined the risk factors of burnout. As previous research have clearly demonstrated which are the risk factors of burnout (e. g., Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001), it is not entirely clear what the actual theoretical contribution of this particularly study is. For instance, we already know that number of hours worked per week is associated to burnout. This is confirmed by the results of the present study.

2. The second concern is associated with framework of the study. I think that author(s) based all the study in a conceptual differentiation of burnout types which is not very established. Although author(s) report some study about its validity, in the burnout literature few authors know or use this framework.

3. Building directly from my last point, I would like to see more information about the burnout scale used in the study. The description is very general, and it's not very known in the burnout field.

4. Regarding the study design, author(s) use a cross-sectional design, which doesn't allow conclusions in terms of causality. Thus, from a design perspective the contribution of the present study is weak.

5. Also in the discussion author(s) are not convincing that this particular study indeed contributes to the body of knowledge. A couple of times references are made to other studies that have yielded similar results and thus confirming the validity of the current study. But it also raises the issue (again) of what this study has contributed.
Minor concerns

6. What about your sample representativeness and generalizability of your findings?

7. The authors offer few implications for practice.

So, all in all, the study was executed technically correctly, but what new do we learn from this?
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