

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ INDJ_ 97797
Title of the Manuscript:	Sleep in Elite Ultrarunners: A Look into Athlete Health
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljamr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manuscript deals with an important topic to scientific community. ▪ The title must be modified in order to be more relevant: Suggestion: Sleep in Elite Ultrarunners: A review of the literature ▪ Need to determine the method of investigating literature: What are the data bases investigated, what are the key words used to research studies about the topic, time interval of studies investigated...= ▪ It would be better to use the standard scientific method for articles IMRAD: Introduction, methods, results, discussion and conclusion, in order to be more relevant or scientific community. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Correct the existing redundances between introduction and background sections. ▪ Respect the form recommended by the journal. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May remove the word "habits" from abstract since the manuscript doesn't state habits of ultrarunners. 	

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:	Sabrine Battal
Department, University & Country	Moroccan Advanced Science Innovation and Research, Morocco