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Reviewer's report:

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

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.

Methods

For each of the outcome measures, the authors should cite the psychometric properties, specifically for the studied population (e.g., Spain). 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.
In the data analysis section, please include the variables of interest reported in the result section and provide a rationale for your approach.

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. I would invite them to explain the significance of the burnout findings in the context of both GPs, physicians but the broader healthcare sector.

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

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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