

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_127303
Title of the Manuscript:	OREXANTS, Orexin Receptor Antagonists: Novel Therapeutic Agents for Insomnia Disorder
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article addresses a topic of great interest to society in general and specifically to people with sleep disorders: insomnia. Sleep disorders are currently a silent pandemic, but there is a stigma attached to it because scientific societies and the scientific societies themselves do not give it more importance. We know that sleep is one of the main physiological functions that helps regulate all other functions. Pharmacological treatment of sleep disorders should be used in clinical cases when non-pharmacological interventions are not sufficient or in other clinical situations of combined treatment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate, but I suggest that when the authors decide what type of review it is, they should refer to the type of review in the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Authors should complete the abstract by stating the type of literature review, the period they have chosen the articles and the search strategy with the Booleans used with the keywords (health descriptors) used from MeSH.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The logic of the sections is appropriate. The flow of information is adequately understood.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The authors use current bibliographical references. I think that the topic they address is of great importance to society from a clinical and socially conscious perspective. Although clinicians should initially opt for non-pharmacological approaches, it is true that there are clinical cases that require pharmacological treatment for a period of time to control their illness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The bibliographical references are recent. It is true that orexin is a drug on which extensive research is being carried out. Authors should incorporate the most recent evidence if they find any more recent articles prior to publication of this article.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The wording of the article in English is understandable, but it is always advisable to have it checked by an expert in scientific language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I understand it to be a literature review. Then it must conform to the journal's author guidelines. Review papers: These papers will not have empirical data acquired by the authors but will include discussion of papers published and data acquired in a specific area. We advise a length of 5000-9000 words, (including 50-150 references plus 3-5 figures and/or tables (if required)). https://journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/general-guideline-for-author</p> <p>-They should state in the abstract what type of review it is. Whether it is a systematic review, a narrative review, a scoping review, a review of the best scientific evidence, an overview review, an integrative review, a concept review, etc. In either case the authors should justify why they have chosen this type of review and set out the search strategies for the articles and the databases used. Could it be a conceptual review of the last 5 years? If so, the authors should specify this in the methodology section of the review. As I said previously, the search strategy formula with the specific keywords and bibliographic databases</p> <p>-They should establish the period of the articles selected to expose and develop the topic of orexin and insomnia.</p> <p>-They should make a review of some acronyms. Because when it appear for the first time they should be described. E.g., Food and Drug Administration (FDA).</p> <p>-They should put the doi in the proper format in the different bibliographic references. E.g., Available: https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp23X731997</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jose Angel Rubino Diaz</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of the Balearic Islands, Spain</p>