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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate that the researcher team had considered all the observations made.

The manuscript is more clear, mostly in the variable definition and management. And you decreased the numbers of references that past the 5 years of publication to 33.8%, which is better and also they explain why is so high in the manuscript.

However, I suggest they analyse as a team the following observations:

- Page 6 line 119, you have to give the values of validity and reliability as you did with PRIME MD instrument. This is applicable to all instrument used.

- About the missing data, is not correct to run analysis with missing data, or you imputed or you delete the person of the data base.

- Why they did bivariate analysis between burnout and work performance and not between burnout and absenteeism? they have to explain.

- If the objective was to explore the relationship between burnout with absenteeism and work performance, the results has to be redacted in that line. The team shows the relationship between absenteeism and fatigue when they literally explain that fatigue and depression were confusion variables described in the literature, so the results can’t be directed in that way. They have to be explicit that in the adjusted model with absenteeism as a predictor, they didn't find a statistical significant association adjusted by fatigue, age, sex and work hours per week. This last variables were the only real adjustment variables because they stay when you run forward and backwards stepping analysis for the logistic regression, not the all set of variables, independently that they had to force some variables in the model (which was good to explain). If the model held other variables when you made this analysis, they have to include these one’s in the table 3. You can add then that the variables fatigue and work hour per week were statistical significant in the model, as you expected to be , because these variables are adjusted variable that don't answer your real question. The same thing has to be done with the Poor Work Performance result.

- You also have to explain why you forced the other variables age and sex, the most of the time we say that they keep in the model because are traditional confounders.
- In the table 3, the fatigue has to be present with the same name

- You have to correct the following references: 8, 39, 40, 59. They don't have the correct format.

I hope you consider this observations as this manuscript is a great contribution to nursing knowledge

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**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.
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