



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2015_AIR_17208
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Sleeping Patterns among Medical Students in the Middle East: Identifying Areas for Intervention</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The article discusses a very interesting topic: sleep in medical students. The highlight of the manuscript is the large sample of students and the high response rate to the questionnaire. However, the absence of a validated instrument affect the interpretation of results. There are several scales used internationally in order to assess the quality of sleep, as the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI). Why was it not used?</p> <p>The authors found relevant results. However, they have not been adequately discussed. I suggest you reflect why some prominent findings (such as sleep and accommodation, sleep and nationality, gender and sleep) and compare your results with previously published.</p> <p>The limitations of the study were not mencionadas. Que limitations you have identified? Write a paragraph or two about it.</p> <p>The Academic Committee of the Masters of Science in Health Policy and Population Studies program approved the research protocol. Study participation was on a voluntary basis and participants were assured of the confidentiality of the study by having the questionnaire anonymous and keeping the completed ones in sealed envelopes.</p>	The manuscript has been amended accordingly.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	I think the number of graphs is excessive. Maybe it is better the information of both sex are present on the same graph. I also suggest that the graphics are modified	Updated



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	to a two-dimensional form.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The idea is interesting. But some adjustments must be made before the final decision.	