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Reviewer’s report:

I am most thankful for the opportunity to review this manuscript, which I have read with great pleasure.

This study revises the Publication Pressure Questionnaire (PPQ) and tests it for reliability and validity. The study is well-designed, the paper well-structured, and the results well-presented.

The weaknesses of the study are acknowledged and the conclusion is positive with respect to the revised PPQ's reliability and validity. In particular it is argued that the PPQr is useful in identifying academic researchers at risk for developing burnout symptoms. However, not knowing whether it is the burnout that makes researchers experience publication pressure or the other way around, it is not clear how the researchers can draw this conclusion.

Some details:

We are informed about how many started the questionnaire and how many provided adequate answers, but the reader may want to know how many were invited.

The respondents are still dominated by biomedicine.

The initial study used a single sample for both item selection and reliability and validity analysis. This weakness is addressed in the reliability study. However, the academics are still dominated by biomedicine.

As acknowledged in the paper, role-conflicts and evaluation criteria are relevant as explanatory alternatives to publication pressure, and it can be argued that not investigating these closer is a weakness of the study. However, this may be the task of a new research project and a new publication.

Another weakness, which is also acknowledged, is that burnout may result in experienced publication pressure and not the other way around. This is a highly relevant objection that should be addressed. However, it is reasonable to argue that this is beyond the scope of the present study.
All in all I think this makes a fine contribution to the literature and the development of relevant instruments to measure challenges to academics.
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