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Reviewer’s report:

This study reports the results of examining the relationships between work stress, positive psychological resources, burnout and well-being in a sample of manufacturing employees. First of all, I’d like to give my congratulations to the authors. Secondly, I have some concerns with both studies as outlined below.

Theoretical development and hypothesis

− More justification is needed about the expected relationships.

− Maybe, it will be interesting to define the main variables in the study.

− More justification is needed about why burnout is conceptualized in the introduction section according to its traditional definition (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization) but it has been measured by the MBI-GS. I think the best is to define burnout in a more synthetic approach for example following to Schaufeli and Enzmann' definition (1998).

− If the objective is to test the role of PsyCap and self-esteem among work stress, and burnout and Flourishing, please specify in the objective and in the title in order to be more precise.

− Authors should specify in more detail the hypothesis of the study, which should be based on recent theory and specifically formulated.

− Authors should be more precise in order to stress, which the specific contributions of the manuscript are. What is 'new' or innovative in your current study?

Participants, and procedure

− More information is needed about the different organizations that participate in the study. There are significant differences on the main variables based on the different companies?

− Please, give more information about the procedure: for example, time spends to answer the questionnaire and about the confidentiality or anonymity in the study.
Measures, and Results

− In the analyses, take care since scales are evaluated using different Likert ranges. For example, extrinsic effort and reward were tested on a 5-point scale, overcommitment was scored from 1 to 4, PsyCap from 1 to 6 and burnout from 0 to 6.

− Authors should think about the possibility to test for method common variance.

− Since authors have a large sample (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996) they should think about the possibility to compute SEM (instead of Hierarchical Regression Analyses) following the conditions of Baron and Kenny and the Sobel or following to procedure of MacKinnon et al. (2002).

− Since the data are dependent that is, employees are embedded in 26 factories, authors should re-think if multilevel treatment of the data is appropriated.

I hope that these previous comments are interesting for authors.
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