# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

**Manuscript NO:** 89277

**Title:** Burnout syndrome and anxiety among healthcare workers during global pandemics: An umbrella review

**Provenance and peer review**: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05270700

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DSc, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Bulgaria

**Author's Country/Territory:** Singapore

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-10-27 13:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-10-28 11:14

**Review time:** 21 Hours

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent　　[  ] Grade B: Very good　　[ Y] Grade C: Good<br>[  ] Grade D: Fair　　[  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Novelty of this manuscript** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent　　[ Y] Grade B: Good　　[  ] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No novelty |
| **Creativity or innovation of this manuscript** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent　　[  ] Grade B: Good　　[ Y] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [  ] Grade A: Excellent    [ Y] Grade B: Good    [  ] Grade C: Fair [  ] Grade D: No scientific significance |
|---|---|
| Language quality | [  ] Grade A: Priority publishing    [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing    [  ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing    [  ] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [  ] Accept (High priority)    [  ] Accept (General priority) [ Y] Minor revision    [  ] Major revision    [  ] Rejection |
| Re-review | [ Y] Yes    [  ] No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [  ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [  ] Yes    [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an umbrella review on burnout and anxiety in healthcare personnel during pandemics. It follows precisely the PRISMA guidelines to select systematic reviews on the topic. The methodology is robust and results are plausible in that sense. However authors are advised to pay more careful attention in the discussion on the differentiation between burnout, depression and anxiety, especially for healthcare system employees. This problem has already been studies extensively (e.g. Toshkova-Hristozova, S., & Haralampiev, D. S. K. (2014). Anxiety and Depression as State Predictors for Burn Out in Health Care. New Model of Burn Out Syndrome: Towards Early Diagnosis end Prevention, River Publishers, Aalborg, Denmark, 115-130.). Its relevance comes from the fact that state anxiety may be considered as meaningful risk factor for bunout in certain context. There are also other fundamental resilience factors which may be considered to influence burnout in medical personnel, especially during pandemics, such as sense of coherence: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.709587. Authors may feel free to disregard the references, yet they are advised to attend to both caveats.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [ Y] Grade B: Very good   [  ] Grade C: Good<br>[  ] Grade D: Fair   [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Novelty of this manuscript** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Good   [ Y] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No novelty |
| **Creativity or innovation of this manuscript** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Good   [ Y] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [   ] Grade A: Excellent     [ Y] Grade B: Good       [   ] Grade C: Fair<br>[   ] Grade D: No scientific significance |
|---|---|
| **Language quality** | [ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing   [   ] Grade B: Minor language polishing   [   ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing   [   ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [   ] Accept (High priority)   [   ] Accept (General priority)<br>[   ] Minor revision   [ Y] Major revision   [   ] Rejection |
| **Re-review** | [ Y] Yes   [   ] No |
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [   ] Anonymous   [ Y] Onymous |
|  | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I would like to thank you for the contribution you have made. The manuscript is well-written; however, there are some concerns of mine which I think need to be taken into consideration.   Summary: Utilizing the PRISMA approach, the authors have ventured on conducting a systematic review on review and summary of evidence on burnout and anxiety in healthcare workers during previous global pandemics. According to the study, female healthcare workers and nurses were identified to be at a higher risk of developing burnout and anxiety during pandemic. There was also a variation in the prevalence of burnouts and anxiety across different studies due to different mental health instruments were used in different studies. There are some limitations in the study. The biggest is the construct validity of the instruments used in different studies. While the studies acknowledge the same keywords or variables, theu utilize different instrumentation. How can this be justified in the study? The authors have briefly mentioned the instrument vriability in their limitations section. However, there needs to be rigorous judtification and an explanation of what the authors did to the partial out the unintended differences. The other point worthy of note,

is the abrupt presentation of the data. It is partly understandable, because it is a review paper, however, the general reader mayy need a bit more to know about the theoretical underpinnings of the study before delving into the main study. My last comment is, the study needs to give a more detailed account of the selection criteria and the procedures taken. Please add more detail to enhance replicability of the study.   Kind regards