

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_119197</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>MENTAL HEALTH AND QUALITY SLEEP AMONG BRAZILIAN MEDICAL STUDENTS DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC: PREVALENCE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1) This manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community for several reasons. Firstly, it highlights the specific impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health and sleep quality of medical students, a group that plays a critical role in healthcare systems. Secondly, it underscores the need for therapeutic interventions and support systems for medical students, providing valuable insights for educational institutions and policymakers. Additionally, the study's findings contribute to the broader understanding of how pandemic-related lifestyle changes can affect mental health, which is crucial for preparing for future public health crises.</p> <p>2) Yes, the title of the article is suitable. The title is comprehensive and inclusive, effectively summarizing the main elements of the study.</p> <p>3) Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It clearly outlines the study's aims, methodology, results, and conclusions, providing a concise summary of the research. However, one line covering only the names of the statistical analysis that are used can be included in the methodology heading. Besides, the abstract effectively covers all major aspects of the study, making it easy for readers to understand the key findings and their implications.</p> <p>4) Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The study is well-organized, with clearly defined sections for the introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. This logical structure allows for a smooth flow of information, making the manuscript easy to follow and understand. Each section contributes to building a coherent narrative around the research question and findings.</p> <p>5) While the manuscript is largely scientifically correct, there are a few areas that could be improved to enhance the robustness of the findings. Firstly, a comment on the normality of the data would provide valuable context for the statistical analyses performed. Secondly, there is a significant difference in the sample sizes of males (23%) and females (76%). This discrepancy could potentially explain why women are showing higher levels of mental distress and sleep problems. It would be beneficial for the authors to perform a chi-square test to determine if the gender difference in the sample size is significant. If the chi-square tests reveal significant demographic differences, especially in the gender, the authors should mention this as a limitation. Additionally, while the titles of the tables are informative, including the name of the statistical test performed in each table title would make it easier for readers, including those from non-scientific backgrounds, to interpret the results. The discussion section is well-written, providing clear and simple explanations of the findings.</p> <p>6) Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. They appropriately cover relevant literature and provide a strong foundation for the study's context and analysis. The inclusion of up-to-date references ensures that the study is grounded in current research and debates within the field.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is scientifically accurate and written in a clear, concise manner, making it accessible to a broad audience. The authors have successfully communicated complex ideas in a way that is easy to understand without sacrificing scientific rigor.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript is well-constructed, scientifically valid, and easy to comprehend for a wide range of readers. The background, methodology, and discussion sections are comprehensive and well-explained. However, the significant difference in gender distribution within the sample warrants further investigation to ensure the reliability of the findings related to gender differences in mental health and sleep quality. This is a satisfactory and commendable attempt, providing valuable insights into an important issue.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vanshika Beri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shree Guru Gobind Singh Tricentenary University, India</b>