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Reviewer's report:

Re-review of the manuscript "Individual and contextual covariates of burnout: a cross-sectional nationwide study of French teachers" by Vercambre et al.

The manuscript has greatly improved during the revision. The authors have revised their paper according to the feedback they have received. However, I find the paper still quite unready. Below are my suggestions to improve this paper. I find them all "major compulsory issues the authors must respond to".

The abstract
1. I wonder if the original sample was representative or might it have been a random sample?
2. After the sentence "2558 teachers provided complete data", add the percentage (of 3940).
3. A sentence regarding the variables used could be added in the methods section.
4. Instead of terms "last" and "first" quartile, use "highest" and "lowest".
5. In the methods- and results-sections, use terms "high emotional exhaustion" and "high depersonalization".
6. In my opinion, overall work perceptions is a wrong term to use when the questions inquire after work satisfaction.
7. In the last sentence of results-section, it is wrong to claim something for influence, since this is a cross-sectional study. Neighbourhood was related to high burnout.
8. In conclusions, I don't understand what is meant by teaching background.

Introduction
9. In the third paragraph, those individual factors which are reviewed here are not included in the study. However, those individual factors which are included in this study are not introduced. Why?
10. In the last paragraph, I think you should include the reference of Lee & Ashforth 1996 when proposing to test the hypothesis of the multidimensionality of burnout. They have studied exactly that, even though not among teachers.
11. Add some justification to why you hypothesize that school neighbourhood
and teaching motivation would relate to burnout risk.

Methods

12. Add the percentage after 2558 teachers included (of 3940).

13. In Characteristics of the study sample, first present the fact that "Our sample reflected the proportion of men and women...; then Table 1 presents ...; and thirdly, "In our sample, gender was closely ...". Leave out the The sample description by gender illustrates -sentence and the sentences starting at "Such an association...". I think it is enough that you state that gender was associates with other variables.

14. I do not think that reported dissatisfaction with work and experienced difficulties are variables of work perception. Name like "work-related factors".

15. Are there any reliability and validity data on these dichotomous measures? What do they measure and how? Are there any references?

Results

16. The last sentence in the first paragraph belongs to the discussion. In the results section, say for example that the comparable values in Europe are ...

17. The last sentence in the second paragraph is not a result; delete it.

18. The first sentence in the multivariate analysis -paragraph is not needed; it is said already in the methods.

19. The sub headlines are not necessary.

20. I think that it is not necessary to highlight the pronounced ORs. I would only refer to Table 5.

Discussion

21. In the last sentence of the first paragraph, You cannot say that burnout should not be conceptualized as unidimensional. As Brenninkmeyer and van Yperen have written, treating burnout variable depends on the study aims. Say something like for example "...which should be taken into account in study design".

22. In the third paragraph, elaborate a little on how gender differences in sources of stress and in social support may explain these observations.

23. In the fourth paragraph, I don't agree that grade level was a key factor in burnout, rather it was an essential associate, for example.

24. In the last sentence of the fourth paragraph, I would add "Difference in the work environment and the sources of stress between grade levels..."

25. In the fifth paragraph, I would add as a fourth sentence, "These contextual factors probably represent special additional challenges in teaching."

26. In the sixth paragraph, I do not understand "teaching as a vocation". I think it should be named differently and the idea explained more thoroughly. Also in burnout literature, too much gap between ideals and realism is presented as a risk for burnout (e.g. Schaufeli & Enzmann 1998).
27. In the seventh paragraph, add that there was a two-fold selection bias: first among the policy holders and then among the teachers in active teaching.

28. Also in the seventh paragraph: I disagree on the statement that there is no reason to suspect that burnout would not influence the accuracy of responses. This holds only to the sociodemographic and other structural factors. It is very likely that burnout influences the perceptions of one's job and job satisfaction. Bias due to common method variance is very likely.

29. One important issue not discussed at all is the reliability and validity of the measures used.

Conclusions

30. I would move the first sentence to the end as the last sentence.
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