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Reviewer’s report:

The authors of the paper have designed a new version of a Publication Pressure Questionnaire by including new subscales. It is a timely and relevant publication as publication pressure as research can increasingly be characterized by more stress and subsequent burn out symptoms. It is a well designed and competently crafted study on which I have just a few questions:

1. Representativeness. Both the pilot study and the larger study on academic research climate in Amsterdam show signs that it does not represent the academic community well. I miss a response rate of the official study, it is heavily biased towards women and researchers in biomedicine, and approximately half of your respondents are PhD students. It suggests that the authors' connections with biomedicine are better than the other disciplines or that their method of distributing the questionnaire has some weaknesses. Please add more information on this process and the sample outcome and offer potential explanations of this bias.

2. The work-home pressure (page 18 and Table 4 in the appendix) shows up as a prominent predictor of burnout. From my own impressions, research and conversations with women I suspect that gender plays an important role in this matter. Do the authors have more information on this? Did they, e.g., check for interaction effects in Table 4 with gender?

Smaller points:

I would suggest to replace the Dutch reference on the facet method (29) by an English source as your paper should offer assistance to the international community.

Typo in Table 1: Conbach should be Cronbach
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