



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	2019/AJPR/47985
Title of the Manuscript:	Sleep-disorders in children and adolescents
Type of Article:	Review Paper

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The authors revised some items, but still kept references/discussion of adults sleep disorders. The proposal of your article is not to compare sleep disorders of children/adolescents vs adults, your aim is to give a good review on sleep disorders in children and adolescents, what is known and what is not known. You made a very good selection of the most prevalent disorders, most parts of the review are very well done and very nicely discussed, so I suggest again:</p> <p>Abstract now is too long, the first version was more direct, and did not need corrections to that extend.</p> <p>Inroduction: although you marked almost all paragraphs, they were not changed (beside some vocabulary, or spelling),,,,just confusing...</p> <p>Page 3 paragraph 5 and 6 are not necessary</p> <p>Pg 4 paragraph 2 is not necessary, the paragraph just below table 2 is not necessary</p> <p>All references for cardiovascular disease are for adults, but there are already important studies for hypertension, structural heart changes in OSA, so please change this</p> <p>Pg 15 OSA...paragraphs 1 -5 are only related to adults and are not necessary</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>You still did not give the information of search strategy (keywords) and inclusion and exclusion criteria for your literature search. This is absolutely necessary</p> <p>I still think that figures 3,4,5 are not of the scope of the theme, and looking at the length of the article they are not necessary and just confounding (bringing data for adult sleep disorder repercussion...your aim is not to discuss comparison of paediatric vs adult sleep disorders.</p> <p>References which are related to adult disorders/studies and are out of scope for your study: 8,9,10 (and the reference 10 is incomplete...no journal year of publication, pages), 13 (If you want to refer to the Jackson Heart Study refer to the KIDS version) 21,22,23,24,25,26, 28, 29,31,35,36,39,56 6 and 49 are duplicated, it is the same reference (51 is the revised edition....maybe you should just use the revised version...) 43 and 48 are duplicated, it is the same reference</p> <p>When editing, there are still a lot of words missing a space between them, please look at this more carefully</p> <p>You have a wonderful article discussing a very important aspect of paediatric health, please make it suitable for the journal, and keep to your aim: discussing sleep</p>	<p>The Aim of the Article is to “review sleep-disorders in children and adolescents”, but in some parts the authors find a need to discuss relevantly in a brief-manner adult sleep-disorders where such disorders happen in both age-groups sometimes making comparisons.</p> <p>The Abstract was revised and re-written in the reason that one of the remaining Reviewers required the authors to do in this manner.</p> <p>Concerning ‘Page 3 para 5 and 6’ the authors now amend the Aim of the Article to include ‘in the clinical-aspect beside epidemiology and disease-burden’ as is noticed in the text of our Article and certain of the References cited. Thus, we seek here to keep para 5 and 6. In the same reason, Para 2 of Page 4.</p> <p>The authors are not able to understand why the paragraph just beneath Table 2 is not necessary. In case it is about CVS diseases, the paragraph does not discuss CVS diseases. Granted, CVS diseases are commoner in adults as complications of OSA but CVS diseases as complications in childhood OSA are not insignificant or unimportant, particularly hypertension and how childhood risk-factors could cause CVS in latter adult-age.</p> <p>Concerning Page 15 paragraphs 1 – 5, the authors have added the sentence ‘Since data such on children such as above is not forthcoming in literature-searches, the authors here use data on adults in an attempt to reflect on the overall situation’.</p> <p>Concerning ‘Methods’ search was not done using key-words only. While exclusion and inclusion concerns (criteria) are routinely listed in Original Researches, Systematic-reviews and Meta-analysis, they are not routinely done in Narrative-reviews. 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.”</p> <p>Figures 3,4,5 are very relevant to the Epidemiology and Disease-burden of sleep-disorders, and thus this article, in the reason these are the best that the authors can provide in the absence of specific such data on children which are not forthcoming in the literature.</p> <p>The authors do not see Ref 8 and 9 being not relevant to the Article. Ref 10, once again in the absence of specific-data on children, allow the best possible picture on the matter.</p> <p>The authors find Refs 21,22,23,24,25,26, 28, 29,31,35,36,39,56 relevant to the article. Atrial fibrillation, changes in weight, heart failure, CVS risks are not irrelevant to childhood and childhood OSA – and, quality of life, health-behavior, performance,</p>



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

disorders in children and adolescents.

psycho-social outcome, blood pressure, polysomnography, mood-disturbance, psychomotor vigilance, performance decrements are relevant to sleep-deprivation in children and adolescents. This is known and does make this article powerful (wonderful) reading. References 22 and 35 are only included as a general-readership – and, the uninterested reader may leave out reading Refs 22 and 35.
Duplications of Refs 6 with 49 and 43 with 48, the authors now attend here to.