



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>I can't see any improvement in this version. It remains disorganized and hard to read.</p> <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. The method: How was the review done? What databases were consulted? What years? What languages? What inclusion/exclusion criteria? How many may research papers were found? Were review papers used? The findings: What was found in the areas of epidemiology, symptoms, course of symptoms, treatments, outcomes? 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? Limitations: What are the limitations of this review? Conclusion: The incontrovertible findings and recommendations based on them.</p>	<p>The review is written with the general readership of the Journal in mind – but, mainly targeted towards paediatricians & those else who may need and wish to be enlightened about sleep disorders – particularly in children & adolescents & how these may need to pay additional attention to the disorder under the circumstances. The Abstract is written in a standard manner (succinct) & already structured in background, aim, method, results, conclusions. The Introduction is written in a standard manner. As the Methodology states 'Literature retrieved through Google Scholar, EMBASE, Medline and PubMed databases were reviewed independently by the authors towards a consensus.' The search was not limited by year. Only articles in the English language were read. (This has been added to the manuscript text). Inclusion/exclusion decisions (criteria) are usually confined to systematic-reviews, non-systematic reviews & meta-analyses & not narrative reviews of this type. The number of papers are as in the Reference-list of this article & those listed in the Reference-list are those being used. Actually, each group of disorder & frequently each specific disorder is being discussed in its 'epidemiology, symptoms, course of symptoms, treatments, outcomes'. Relevantly & frequently, the authors have discussed earlier papers & reviews sometimes comparing regions as in the discussion of the economic-cost of the disorder in general – both old & new as appropriate. Conclusions are based on a consensus among the authors & pertinent to the Background & Findings.</p>