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Reviewer’s report:

The aim of the present study was to investigate the relationships between work stress, positive psychological resources, burnout and wellbeing. In a cross-sectional study, the authors administered the Chinese version of the ERI questionnaire, the Psychological Capital Questionnaire, the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey, as well as other self-report instruments, to 1500 manufacturing workers. Overall, the authors found several mediation effects of positive psychological resources in the relationship between work stress and job burnout and well-being. The content of the manuscript appears to be interesting. However, in my opinion, some issues need to be addressed. Detailed comments are reported below.

***

p.3, lines 73-76: The authors described the original model of burnout, although in their study they (consistently) administered the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey, as they pointed out at p.7, lines 168-170, that can be used in different occupational contexts. Therefore, in my opinion, the authors could provide a short description of the MBI-GS in the introduction.

p.4, lines 88-90: the authors explore the association between occupational stress and both job burnout and well-being. However, they do not mention specific form of well-being considered in the present study (which is flourishing, as pointed out in the following "Materials and Methods" section). Therefore, I would provide a short description of flourishing in the introduction. Additionally, why do the authors consider flourishing and not (for example) work engagement? Indeed, work engagement is often regarded as a form of well-being (see for example Bakker & Oerlemans, 2011, Subjective well-being in organizations), which is also related to job burnout.

p.5, lines 133-134: As far as I understand, cases with missing values were included in the following analyses. If this is the case, how did the authors address missing values?

p.8, lines 184-197: this section is not clear, in my opinion. How many models were estimated (e.g., were ERI and overcommitment entered in the same model or in different models? What about mediators)? Were the models estimated using a macro? Results from Table 3 and 4 are from the same models?

p.8, lines 197-198. As far as I know, bootstrap procedures should be applied to unstandardized (rather than to standardized) data (see for example Cheung, 2009, Comparison of methods for constructing confidence intervals of standardized indirect effects)
p.9, lines 227-233. Usually, mediation is established when the indirect effect is different from zero. Since in the present study the significance of the indirect effects was determined using bootstrapping, in my opinion the authors should first describe the results of the resampling technique (the "Mediating effects of PsyCap and self-esteem" section), and then describe the mediation, in terms of "partial" or "full" mediation.

p.9, lines 239-242: the same applies to this section of the manuscript, in my opinion.

p.9, lines 232-233, "PsyCap and self-esteem were probably and partially mediated the relationship between ERR and professional efficacy". In my opinion, this sentence is not clear.

p.9, line 237-238: "PsyCap and self-efficacy were positively and significantly associated with well-being, respectively". Did the authors mean "self-esteem" (instead of self-efficacy)?

p.10, line 278-281, "Workers with high effort, such as time and energy, might tend to experience more negative emotions. When the level of extrinsic effort exceeded intrinsic reward, physical and mental health could easily lead to burnout and decrease the level of psychological well-being". Interestingly, in my opinion, the relationships between occupational stress, emotions, and job burnout could be explained in the light of the Allostatic Load model (see for example Girardi et al., 2015, The mediating role of interpersonal conflict at work in the relationship between negative affectivity and biomarkers of stress).

p.12, line 326: the word "traits" could be misleading in my opinion, since it usually refers to stable individual characteristics, whereas the authors previously pointed out that "PsyCap refers to a positive state of mind exhibited during the growth and development of an individual and consists of four state-like psychological resources: hope, self-efficacy, optimism and resilience, all of which are measurable, developable and manageable" (p.4, lines 103-105).

p.12, lines 330, "limitation" section of this manuscript. In my opinion, as a minor concern, the authors could acknowledge that some associations, such as the correlation between overcommitment and professional efficacy in Table 2 (as well as some regression coefficients in Table 3), are statistically significant - given the large sample size - but very small, for example being below the cut-off value proposed by Cohen for small correlations (see Cohen, 1992, A power primer).

Table 3: I found this table quite difficult to follow (formatting problems). The same also applies to Table 2 and Table 4.
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