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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for allowing me to review the revision of your paper. I found the manuscript to be an improvement over the last version, and I remain interested in the research question posed. However, I remain concerned about some issues, most of them minor ones. But let me start with my three major points:

1. Although I appreciate the effort the authors took in addressing each of the comments, I thought that some of the revisions were rather shallow fixes or "band-aid" attempts to cover deeper problems. Particularly with regard to the issue of the contribution of the current study. I do not feel that what new was added in explaining the process of burnout. As I pointed out in the previous review, the literature have already demonstrated which are the risk factors of burnout.

2. Although the information about the conceptualization and measure of burnout has been expanded somewhat, I'm not convinced about this point. I do not think that this approach is exactly burnout. Your measure of burnout includes some factors that can be considered antecedents (e.g., lack of acknowledgement) or consequences (e.g. "lack of control") of the syndrome. What everybody consider burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, Bakker; Shirom, etc), is not the same that you are measuring. You have based your paper on the work of Dr Farber, but most of his work have been published in books, which means that it haven't been exposed to the opinions of referees. For example, the clinical classification is not very well known in the field. I'd expect the authors to provide a stronger explanation for the use this approach instead of the well-established.

3. I do not agree with some of your arguments. In page 12 you indicated that "The fact that these sociodemographic and occupational variables existed prior to the time of measurement (which implies fulfilment of the premise of temporal precedence)". This is not completely true. First, some of your variables may fluctuate (nº of working hours) overtime. Second, although these variables already exist, this doesn't imply the fulfilment of the premise of temporal precedence. There other forms of causation, such as reverse of reciprocal. Third, some parts of your paper present a reasoning that implies causality, and you cannot talk about it. Please, you should change these parts.

Minor points
4. There are still some typos and grammatical errors in the manuscript. Please, proof read it carefully.