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Reviewer’s report:

It is an interesting topic but this paper must be improved. The authors have to clarify and explain hypotheses, variables, method and results. We have to see more information about data analysis, results section and background in discussion section.

Several comments:

Background:

The authors mentioned (p.5) "few qualitative studies focused on individual experiences of patients on chronic hemodialysis". It is not true. A lot of references were forgotten: Jonasson & Gustafsson, 2017; Clarkson and Robinson, 2010; Makaroff, 2012; Stringer and Baharani, 2012; Karamanidou, Weinman and Horne, 2014; Schell et al., 2012; Karamanidou, Weinman and Horne, 2014; Xhulia et al., 2015; Chiaranai, 2016; Rezaei, Jalali, Jalali c, Khaledi-Paveh, 2018.... in the same way this paper is not present: "a thematic synthesis of the experiences of adults living with hemodialysis" by Reid, Seymour and Jones, 2016.

Method:

Sample: we can observe a large standard deviation in participant's dialytic mean age in months, it is potentially a limit of this study because other studies have shown that duration of hemodialysis is a central determinant of this experience. The authors have to explain the choice to include patients in the study after 12 months of hemodialytic treatment.

Data analysis

➢ The authors do not explain why and how they convert answers to each question into nominal or quantitative ratings

➢ The authors do not comment descriptive data of the study participants (questionnaire results)/ cut-off, mean,…

➢ How is data used from BDI and STAI questionnaires, laboratory parameters?
Why are trait and state anxiety measured?

How are evaluated “interference of the HD treatment in social life, the importance of family understanding of patient situation”? Why are they not included in the 8 topics?

Results and discussion

(P.13) Authors write "the sample was split according to the gender variable" : justify why; did you have any hypotheses?

In the discussion section, it lacks comparison between present results and those of Reid, Seymour and Jones, 2016.

Authors write "The reason why gender variable can be considered as a mediating variable between fatigue and reward system…" would you rather say "moderating" variable?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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