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Reviewer's report:

Understanding burnout according to individual differences: Usefullness of “Burnout Clinical Subtype Questionnaire” versus “Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey”, a cross sectional study

This paper describes a cross-sectional study designed to estimate and to compare the explanatory power of 2 typological models, short and long, with the standard measurement for burnout in a sample of 409 university employees.

In all, the study seems well implemented. However, some changes are deemed necessary in order to improve the ms. More specifically:

Title

The title should change in order to better reflect the content of the study. Something like: Ongoing psychometric evaluation of 2 scales measuring burnout.

Abstract

Arithmetic results are not normally presented in the abstract. A shorter and more substantial version would benefit the paper.

Background

I would like to see a bit more of the theoretical underpinnings of the scales used. In addition, the authors do not seem to differentiate from the initial burnout model put forth by Maslach and colleagues. However, it seems that what they are doing is a refinement, and better quantification of it. Thus, I don't see the reason to describe the new scale as competing to the initial MBI but rather more of a complementary, or a refinement. Thus, a more critical approach should be reflected in the review of literature section of the paper. This is deemed necessary, since it will eventually lead to the formulation of hypotheses, which are nonexistent, and eventually will guide the subsequent statistical analyses.

Method

Sampling

Any justifications for the sample used? Why these particular employees?
Results
Why do not the authors report results from correlational analyses? In addition, it will be an asset to the paper to provide the reliability coefficients of all the subscales of the measures used.

Discussion
One of the critical aspects of this psychometric study is the lack of test retest reliability analysis that would strengthen the findings. The authors should mention this in the limitations of the study.

Conclusions
A more thorough discussion of the implications of the study should finalize the section.
Finally, a thorough proof reading of the ms would improve its quality since language problems limit the reader’s understanding and cause unnecessary confusion.

In all, I believe that this study has a potential for scientific contribution to the area of the study of burnout. Therefore, Major Compulsory Revisions should be made in order for the ms to be publishable.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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