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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editors,

We would like to present a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments:

Editor Comments:

1. Please address the comments provided by reviewer 4. These can be found below.
Yes, thank you for your comments. We think they definitively improve our manuscript.
We hope to have satisfactorily addressed all these technical issues.

2. Please clearly indicate the Corresponding Author on the Title Page of your manuscript.
We have clearly indicated the Corresponding Author.

3. Please include three to ten keywords representing the main content of the article, below your abstract and above the main text of your manuscript.
I’m sorry but the Keywords are already in that position (page n°4).

4. Please change the section heading “Introduction” to “Background”.
We have changed this indication.

5. Please add a “Conclusions” section after the “Discussion”. This should state clearly the main conclusions of the research article and give a clear explanation of their importance and relevance.
Yes, thank you for your appreciation. This section had to be mentioned. Hopefully, now we have introduced clear conclusions.

6. Please represent authors' names using their full initials, not their full name, in the Authors’ Contributions section. If there are any duplicated initials, please differentiate them to make it clear that the initials refer to separate authors.
We have changed this information.

7. Please include a statement in the Authors' contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.
We have introduced this information. This manuscript was accepted by all authors.
8. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

We have submitted all the information following these norms.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 4): PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I have provided my input based on each section of the submission. Overall, the authors have sufficiently addressed the previous reviewers suggestions and with my revisions, I believe the article should be accepted for publication.

I invite them to address my concerns to strengthen the quality of the paper. In particular, please delve further into the discussion of your findings to the broader literature.

Thank you for this observation; our results had to be better linked with the existing literature. Hopefully, now they will be more precisely stated, such is the case of burnout, psychological well-being or opinions towards mental disorders.

Burnout is a timely topic and of attention to scholars across the globe. Your findings will be meaningful when linked to this international literature.

Yes we agree. Hopefully, now our findings have been linked more precisely in Discussion.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Introduction

The author should also state briefly the extent of burnout among GPs. There is a growing field of literature in this area, and scholars from both clinical and research disciplines have discussed the prevalence and extent of this health issue in the physician workforce. As it stands, the reader is not well situated to appreciate the importance of this study.

We agree, in order to justify better the study’s purposes, we had to improve this contextual information. In this line, new data is provided.

Methods

For each of the outcome measures, the authors should cite the psychometric properties, specifically for the studied population (e.g., Spain).

Yes, thank you for your appreciation. Now we have reported all the psychometric properties detailed within its Spanish validation survey.

Finally, a brief description of each instrument has been included.
Also, did the authors consider using the Maslach Burnout Inventory - Human Services Survey for Medical Personnel (MBI-HSS (MP))? This version of the questionnaire is specifically for medical personnel. The authors should discuss their rationale.

First, we have to into account that the Spanish translation was based on:


Sample: 559 professionals from diverse occupational services sectors (health, education, police, hotels and banks).

According to Loera and colleges (doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0114987) “the first versions of the MBI, intended for workers employed in health and social services, was later renamed MBI-Human Service Survey (MBI-HSS) to differentiate it from the one developed for educators, the MBI-Educators’ Survey (MBI-ED)”.

So, yes, the authors considered (Gil-Monte & Peiró, 1999) this MBI version as the “classical version”, later renamed MBI-HSS. We have included this information in the text.

In the data analysis section, please include the variables of interest reported in the result section and provide a rationale for your approach.

We have included this information in Data analysis.

Results

Results are appropriate and I am satisfied with the authors' responses to the previous reviewer.

Discussion

The authors should link their findings to the existing literature.

We agree. We have added new scientific literature that justifies better the links between our findings and the existing literature. Specially, we have to mention the burnout factor as well as the psychological well-being or opinions towards mental disorders.

If this is still not satisfactory for the editors, we could provide even further arguments and data exposing these relations.

I would invite them to explain the significance of the burnout findings in the context of both GPs, physicians but the broader healthcare sector.
Yes, definitively this information should be included for a better contextualization. We have compared our findings not only with other GPs, but also with other health professionals. New references have been included.

The authors so state the limitation associated with self-reported data.

Yes, this issue should be better explained. We have provided examples of Response bias in self-reported data besides related bibliography for a closer look.

Finally, we would like to stress that the order of authors has not been altered. Nonetheless, only the institution “Direcció d’Atenció Primària Costa de Ponent, Institut Català de la Salut” has adopted a new reference style; so we have been required to introduce it.