Reviewer’s report

Title: Psychometric properties of the St. Elizabeth Youngstown Hospital Wellbeing Inventory and Non-Burnout Inventory for physicians and nurses

Version: 0 Date: 07 Jan 2019

Reviewer: Noriko Cable

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for letting me to the work, examining the reliability and validity of a well-being measure. I agree that nurses and doctors are vulnerable working populations suffering from growing work demands and expectations who are prone to burnout. However, it is not very clear the need of developing a new measure, while we have plethora of measures to assess well-being, mental health, and stress level, including burnout. The main weakness is lack of sample size; it is a custom to use a large sample size more than 1000 to test validity of the measure. I understand this might be a pilot work. If so, conclusions should be made, addressed this limitation.

Background:
This was short. Authors need to critique existing literature to justify why they needed to develop their measure by highlighting weakness/limitation of the existing literature, especially the target population. If they can revise this significantly, readers are likely to understand the study aim.

Methods:
Sample size is a problem here. Authors need to justify the size. If this is a pilot, they need to state in abstract as well.

Conclusions:
Given the sample size, they may want to modify their concluding statement.

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.

No
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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