

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_128774
Title of the Manuscript:	Burden of Burnout Syndrome among Emergency Physicians in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Review comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study mentions in exclusion criteria," Studies were excluded if they did not meet the inclusion criteria', it is implied and need not be mentioned 2. The PRISMA flow of selection of studies for meta analysis is not very clear about how and what process was adopted for ruling out studies , if done manually or any software ? 3. « The meta-analysis included five studies to estimate the prevalence of high emotional exhaustion among emergency physicians in Saudi Arabia. »after mentioning 6 studies for final analysis , the authors chose to show 5 study results, with no proper explanation 4. The screening criteria was also not reflective of the fact that they chose to consider studies as varied time frame from 2010 to 2022 and had no mention of the minimum sample size of the chosen studies. 5. With only 5 studies, the authors have employed funnel study of assymetry and claimed publication bias etc, wheras, «As a rule of thumb, tests for funnel plot asymmetry should be used only when there are at least 10 studies included in the meta-analysis, because when there are fewer studies the power of the tests is too low to distinguish chance from real asymmetry ». 6. While considering burn out prevalence, only 3 studies has been considered. 7. Although Burn out among emergency physicians happens to be a very relevant and apt research topic , the meta analysis and systematic review conducted has many fundamental design errors that may not be appropriate to substantiate any scientific claim based on that. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Aditi Aikat</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>JIMSH, India</p>