

Paper: **“Financial Stress Relationship with Work Life and Financial Well-Being”**

Submitted: 19 November 2021

Accepted: 22 February 2022

Published: 28 February 2022

Corresponding Author: Suna Ozyuksel

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n6p87](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n6p87)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kazimierz Albin Klosinski
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

Reviewer 2: Blinded

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title of the study and the content of the study are appropriate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

In the study, the stress sources of employees and their effects on working life were examined. In the study, it was also tried to measure the stress levels, anxiety levels, job performances and psychological resilience levels of the employees with the help of a scale.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

There are no significant grammatical or spelling errors in the study.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Working methods are explained in details. A sufficient level of literature research has been done in the theoretical part. In the application part, a sufficient number of samples were used in accordance with the scale used.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The content part of the article supports the hypothesis. In the application part, the results obtained are explained in detail with the help of tables.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The summary part of the study gives an important idea about the study. Likewise, in the conclusion part, it supports the theoretical and practical structure of the study and provides important information about the whole study. The conclusion part and the content of the study overlap.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Sufficient number of sources were used in the study. All sources used in the text are included in the bibliography. The number of sources used in the literature section is also sufficient.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A rectangular text input field with a light gray border. On the right side, there is a vertical scroll bar with a small handle. At the bottom, there are four small square buttons: a left-pointing arrow, a right-pointing arrow, and two empty square boxes.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Kazimierz Kłosiński	
University/Country: The John Paul Catholic University of Lublin	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 XI 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 3 XII 2021
Manuscript Title: FINANCIAL STRESS RELATIONSHIP WITH LIRE and FINANCIAL WELL - BEING	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1225/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>Yes, is clear and adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes, clearly presents</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There are not grammatical errors, but the language of the work is here and there model slang, inexplicable for reader</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The methodology – in the large measure – is introduced the language too hermetic, inexplicable to reader</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes, is clear, but in many cases exists the difference between number passed in tables and numbers passed in description</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes they are accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes, they are comprehensive and appropriate. In Introduction the review of literature is spacious and interesting</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Side 6, 10-11 line from above, component in the parenthesis are undefined, 16 line from above – VFA undefined; 18-19 line from above, sign and size are not qualified;

Side 7, 10-12 line from beneath, necessary note introducing TRY [Turkey Lira, code ISO 4217];

Side 10, Table 5, I propose the arrangement:

Disagree/ Completely Disagree

Undecided

Agree/Completely Agree

Side 15, Table 12 is inexplicable [the lack of explanations];
Side 16, Table 14, the lack explanation for “”;**
Side 17 and 18, given numerical in Table 16 and in Table 17 are identical [?];
Side 19, it lacks tables to descriptions in three passages of text under Table 19;
Side 20, it lacks the table to description in first passage of the text from above;
It lacks tables for two passages of the text under Table 21;
Side 21, it lacks the table to the passage of the text under Table 23;
Side 24-25, Appendix A I find in this form superfluous [it is inexplicable].

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work is interesting and valuable so in the empirical sphere and theoretical too.