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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. It is well-written in a level appropriate to this journal's readership. The topic is timely, and the subject is important.

The paper title and purpose are appropriate and congruent, and well portrayed in the text. Content is of high quality and depicted in a scholarly manner.

The literature review seems to end in 2016 (line 70) and misses several relevant reports of studies relating nurse burnout and outcomes published within the past 3 years.

The paper and findings are strengthened by use of standardized survey instruments however validity of the HPQ when used for evaluating nursing work performance and the study's delineation of cutoff scores determining low performance do not appear to be evidence based for nursing populations. Justification with the inclusion of references supporting these decisions must be incorporated.

At the end of the abstract (line 52) and in the body of the manuscript in lines 68, 252 and 298, authors use the term "productivity" as if it is an outcome measured in the study, however the study was not designed to measure or imply productivity. The manuscript provides no definition for this term (which usually refers to measure of the efficiency of a person in converting inputs to useful outputs) and the conceptual relationship between study measures and productivity are not described. The phrase "impact of nurse burnout on productivity, such as absenteeism and work performance, which could add strain the adequacy of the workforce in an area of nurse work force shortage" is not supported by reference 25. Referring to study outcomes as including or implying productivity should be removed.

In the analysis write up I did not see mention of checking for multicollinearity among variables. Were depression and burnout highly correlated? If yes, how was this handled in your analysis? This should be discussed in the analysis section.
Rather than list the study's sample as a strength, it should be included in the weaknesses. Regardless of the sample size, the sample does not well represent U.S. nurses. For example, approximately 25% of respondents worked in inpatient settings when evidence supports that approximately 60% of nurses work in inpatient settings. The sample characteristics for BSN saturation and education are also not close to government reports of U.S. nurse population statistics.

Consideration of the previous comments and associated improvements will expand ability of the paper to provide helpful insights about nurse burnout and expand on baseline evidence supporting future research.

**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.

Unable to assess

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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