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### Compulsory REVISION comments

**Reviewer's comment**

Dear author(s). Your study is important and valuable. However your article needs to be improved. Best luck and wishes. Here are my suggestions:

**Overall:** English language needs to be professionally edited.

**Introduction:** Too short. Enhance and improve this section. There are many studies from all around the world concerning your study subject. They could be helpful to you for re-arranging this section. At the end of this section mention your aim, rationale of your study and your hypotheses.

**Methods:**
Information about Quality of life enjoyment and satisfaction questionnaire is needed.
When was this instrument developed, by whom (reference). Is it original or is it adapted? Validation results of this instrument. Similar information is needed for perceived stress scale.
In the abstract you mentioned that you have used SPSS 18 and in data analysis section you mentioned that you have used SPSS 17

**Results:**
Why did you use multiple linear regression? Why not logistic regression analysis?
How is your data distributed?

**Discussion:** Enhance and improve this section. Compare your results with the results of similar studies. Mention discrepancies and similarities.

**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)

### Minor REVISION comments

**Reviewer Details:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nazan Bilgel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department, University &amp; Country</td>
<td>Family Medicine, Uludag University Faculty of Medicine, Turkey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>