



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_15162
Title of the Manuscript:	Teacher Burnout: A Review of Sources and Ramifications
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	A) Conclusion It seems mandatory to me that a good review article should include these sections in the conclusion/discussion part: 1. Limitations 2. Future research directions	Thank you so much for your constructive comment. These sections were added at the end of the article marked in yellow.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	A) Introduction 1. On page 1, par. 1: "Although there is not yet an acceptable definition for burnout, the idea is considered as a response to the persistent emotional damage of examining others in need". - This sentence seems strange to me, suggesting that burnout only happens in professions where caring for others is a central part of work. I suggest the authors revise their position, or clarify, explain and provide arguments to solidify it. 2. On page 2, par3: "In another thorough classification, three major categories in teacher burnout were considered : background variables such as age, gender, etc." - It would be helpful for the reader to state more variables here, such as education, tenure, etc. B) Conclusion	1. it was revised to accommodate your valuable comment. 2. added 3. added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. On page 14, par 2: “At the organizational level, the strategies might include [...] teaching plan.” - The authors should consider adding here the following, as it was stated in their review and these are important burnout factors : - o Reducing role conflict by clarifying roles - o Reducing work overload and work pressure, for example by reducing administrative work (paperwork)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a thorough and complete review of teacher burnout which will be helpful for both researchers and practitioners in this field. The manuscript is well structured and written. The documentation and analysis methods were rigorously performed.	Thank you so much for your encouraging comment.