REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52284

Date: 16-6-25

Title:
 A study to identify the predictors of burnout among critical care nurses.

Recommendation:
Accept as it is …………………………………
Accept after minor revision………………
Accept after major revision ……………….
Do not accept (*Reasons below*) ……

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality				✓
Techn. Quality				✓
Clarity				✓
Significance				✓

Reviewer Name: Dr Jaishree Suresh

Date: 16-6-2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(*To be published with the manuscript in the journal*)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

....

While the topic has merit and the authors appear to have access to valuable field data, the current manuscript falls short in terms of scientific writing, analytical depth, and methodological transparency. I recommend that the authors revise the manuscript thoroughly, ideally with professional editing support and research design consultation and consider resubmitting it as a new manuscript.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The topic of burnout among critical care nurses is undeniably important and highly relevant, especially in the current healthcare context. The authors have made a commendable effort in attempting to study a large sample across multiple centres. However, the manuscript in its current form lacks the academic rigor, clarity, and depth required for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.

Major Concerns:

Language and Presentation:

The manuscript suffers from serious grammatical errors, inconsistent sentence structure, and lack of clarity in several places. This significantly hampers readability and undermines the credibility of the findings.

Repetition of content (e.g., objectives stated multiple times) and poorly constructed tables reduce the overall professionalism of the presentation.

Methodology:

The use of non-probability purposive sampling for such a large-scale study is questionable. The sample size (789) is impressive, but the method of selection introduces bias and limits generalizability.

Important methodological details, such as how burnout thresholds were defined or how data was analysed statistically, are either insufficiently explained or missing.

The explanation of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory is overly verbose and seems to misunderstand the nuances of interpreting results on a continuum.

Results and Interpretation:

The results section is heavily descriptive and lacks meaningful analysis. The association between variables and burnout is not statistically convincing in the absence of clearly reported p-values, confidence intervals, or effect sizes.

There is inconsistency between reported associations and the actual statistical outcomes (e.g., chi-square values not always supporting stated conclusions).

There is little to no interpretation of what the results *mean* in a practical or theoretical sense.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Discussion and Literature Integration:

The discussion does not go beyond reiterating results. There is minimal critical engagement with current literature.

Citations are used inconsistently, and some are improperly formatted or referenced without adequate context.

The conclusion, while well-intentioned, is generic and not strongly supported by the study's findings.

Formatting and Structure:

The manuscript lacks uniform formatting and appropriate section demarcation.

Numerous typographical and referencing errors further diminish the scholarly presentation.