

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_96652
Title of the Manuscript:	PROFILE OF ANXIETY AND DEPRESSION SYMPTOMS ASSOCIATED WITH SLEEP QUALITY OF MEDICAL STUDENTS IN THE EASTERN AMAZON
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<https://www.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. This is a novel topic and interesting. Findings are important to the scientific community. 2. Title is ok and suitable. 3. Abstract: Research objective required to explain more. Are there any policy implications? Add the novelty of the research. 4. Introduction: Research gap is not explained well. Literature Survey: Couldn't find literature survey. Suggest collecting recent literature (at least last three years) to support research problem and compare finding of this research is supported. Methodology: Sound good. However, recommend giving detail explanation about research design, population, sampling methods (random or cluster etc.), sample size and base for it, reliability, and validity. Findings and Discussion: Good. Have evidence-based discussion and conclusion. However, if you have strong literature survey, findings would be more supported. Policy Implication, Limitations, Recommendation: Suggest adding these sections. 5. Researchers applied scientific method to some extent. Recommend to add sound literature review to improve the quality of the paper. 6. Suggest referring recent articles. You can have updated knowledge.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Proof reading required.	
Optional/General comments	Interesting topic and findings would be strong if research is strongly supported with literature. Recommend to publish after revising.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wasantha Rajapakse
Department, University & Country	SLIIT Business School, Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology, Sri Lanka