



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_47985
Title of the Manuscript:	Sleep-disorders in children and adolescents
Type of the Article	<u>Review Paper</u>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors need to rethink the organization of this paper. They are doing a review of sleep disorders in children and adolescents intended for what audience? The abstract needs to be succinct: background, aim, method, results, conclusions. The introduction should be short addressing the fact that this area of medicine/paediatrics is understudied.</p> <p>The method: How was the review done? What databases were consulted? What years? What languages? What inclusion/exclusion criteria? How many research papers were found? Were review papers used?</p> <p>The findings: What was found in the areas of epidemiology, symptoms, course of symptoms, treatments, outcomes?</p> <p>Discussion: How do these findings compare with other reviews in this field? Which ones are new? Which pertain to which cultures/geographic regions? Which ages?</p> <p>Limitations: What are the limitations of this review?</p> <p>Conclusion: The incontrovertible findings and recommendations based on them.</p>	<p>This is meant as a Narrative Review and not a Systematic Review. And, it is targeted to the usual general readership of the Journal – but, especially paediatricians and those with an interest/expertise in sleep-disorders. The authors won't reiterate that sleep-disorders are understudied in Medicine, but remark that sleep-disorders need more attention in children and adolescents – although that is not the only or even primary aim of this Article. In our Method, we have described the Method in the manner Methodology of Narrative Reviews are most commonly outlined. Reviews are essentially knowledge-synthesis for readership - Pawson et al (2005) in describing Realist Reviews "The aim is to enable decision-makers to reach a deeper understanding of the intervention and how it can be made to work most effectively. Realist review does not provide simple answers to complex questions. It will not tell policy-makers or managers whether something works or not, but will provide the policy and practice community with the kind of rich, detailed and highly practical understanding of complex social interventions which is likely to be of much more use to them when planning and implementing programmes at a national, regional or local level." It is not the Aim of our Article to compare with previous such Reviews. Limitations are usually listed for Original Research (with much more rigid and structured Methodology) and not for Narrative Reviews such as ours.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	English grammar needs edits.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	