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Reviewer’s report:

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. p.6f.: It is not true that you have only 2 dependent variables because on p. 11 you report results for three different burnout variables.

2. p.9: There is no logical relation between Cronbachs alpha and reliability. Alpha solely measures item consistency. Don't use the term "reliability" here.

3. p.9: With 112 items and 3 factors you are estimating 336 parameters in a sample out of 280 persons. You should better omit items beforehand before running PCA (omit those which decrease alpha, if omitted).

4. p.9: PCA is known to yield more factors than usual (maximum likelihood) explorative factor analysis. Maybe you wouldn't need second order factors then, which are not familiar to most readers.

5. p. 13: Interactions in terms of odds ratios are independent of causal synergy (Greenland S. Basic problems in interaction assessment. Environ Health Perspect 1993; 101(Suppl 4): 59–66). Risk differences would be more informative but there is no way to do a better analysis in SPSS.

6. p. 13: Don't use causal language ("influence").

7. p.13: Don't mis-interperte odds ratios (e.g. "nineteen times more likely"; it would be actually "nineteen times AS likely") as risk ratios.

8. p.17, 1st sentence of "conclusions": Inference should be only drawn on the specific population you investigated.

9. Table 4: The

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

2. p.6: You need to provide 1-2 sentences about possible response bias already here.

1. p. 8: How many dummy variables were used to adjust for occupational status?

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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