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Reviewer’s report:

This article is important because it provides new data on worker conditions of domestic workers, a group that is exploited all over the world. They add more evidence about such exploitation by documenting their situation in Singapore. The article needs significant changes before publication, including the naming of these female domestic workers as foreign instead of immigrant domestic workers. I have the following suggestions for the authors to improve it:

1) The title is too long as is. I suggest to change it to "The impact of job stressors on the quality of life and health of female immigrant domestic workers in Singapore." In addition, to call the domestic workers in Singapore as foreign instead of immigrant is a choice that may separate this study from the larger body of literature that discusses domestic workers as immigrants. Is there a reason to call them foreign instead of immigrants? Aren't they economic migrants, as many others all over the world?

2) The abstract should include a short description of the statistical analyses conducted in the methods section of it.

3) The abstract results do not read well. I suggest to rewrite it by including the sentence on page 10, line 30 in the results section. The new sentence reads "... age was found to be significantly (p<0.05) associated with overall quality of life and three domains (psychological, social, and environmental health."

4) Provide source(s) for the information described in page 4, lines 20-35.

5) Page 5- lines 8-10- Karasek's demand-control model always included the social support dimension. The book listed as reference 18 discusses the three dimensions of his model in detail.

6) The specific objectives listed in page 6, lines 18-35 should be moved to the methods section.

7) The Methods section has to be reorganized according to the itemization suggested in the journal's website. The sections should be: Design&Aims&Setting; Participants& Materials; Data Collection (instead of procedure); and Statistical Analysis.

8) The first paragraph on page 8 should be moved to the end of the methods section.
9) The first paragraph of the section results should be moved to the data collection sub-section of methods section.

10) There is no need to show percentiles in table 2. Mean, standard deviation and percentages are enough.

11) The discussion section repeats too many results (e.g., the first three paragraphs in the results section, page 12-13) and does not discuss enough the findings based on literature that either supports or contradicts them. The study found that age and work experience are important factors to explain better quality of life of FDWs in Singapore. Are those findings new or not? Are there other studies of domestic workers that confirm or reject the associations found?

12) The paragraph that starts on p. 12, line 79 should be rewritten, as follows: "Older workers and those with more work experience are likely to have better social support. Very socially connected women showed the highest quality of life scores...." On the other hand, feeling stressed....

13) The first paragraph of a new section titled conclusion should be the one that is now between lines 17-32 of page 14. The new section should start on line 15 of page 15. The paragraph that is on page 15, line 15 should become the second paragraph of the section conclusion.

14) The sentence in lines 33-35, p.15, should be removed because it is repetitive. It starts with "In conclusion..."

15) The citations do not follow the journal's author instructions either. They need to be reformatted.
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