



**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**

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Discuss the Internal / external validity</b> of the results, considering the tool for collecting data (questionnaire).</li> <li>- The design of the present study involves students submitted to both PBL (2<sup>nd</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> years) and not PBL (1<sup>st</sup> year). It could be a <i>bias</i>. Otherwise, it could be a relevant field of discussion (the authors have an almost paired comparison groups). The authors should use this difference in their favor. In this sense, I strongly suggest to the authors explore the PBL basis to improve the discussion. Some papers could be helpful (<a href="http://www.scholarly-journals.com/sjm/archive/2012/june/pdf/Castro%20et%20al.pdf">http://www.scholarly-journals.com/sjm/archive/2012/june/pdf/Castro%20et%20al.pdf</a>; <a href="http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00891779">http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00891779</a>)</li> <li>- Authors wrote “ ....accommodation status showed statistically significant differences...”. It means that they have applied a statistical test. It was Chi-square? How about the <i>p</i> value? This question must be extended to all similar data.</li> <li>- Considering the analyzed variables, what is the weight/strength of each one? For example: “accommodation” : what is the importance of the accommodation to the reality of the sampled students? And how about the “nationality”? Please, tell more specifically? Are they from a region with another biological clock?</li> </ul>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Typos. Please, it must be reviewed.</li> <li>- The English language must be evaluated.</li> </ul>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The authors present an observational cross sectional study among AGU medical students to reach a sleeping patterns in order to promote healthy and better sleeping patterns among them. It is an important field of investigation, mainly considering undergraduate students. It looks like the authors were disconnected to the methods of learning, in which the students are imputed. Besides the analyzed variables, the authors should give an attention also to this point.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Carolina Baraldi Araujo Restini</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Medicine, University of Ribeirão Preto, Brazil</b>