

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_122519</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Understanding the human Chronotype research</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript offers valuable insights into the significance of chronotypes in human health and productivity, shedding light on their interaction with societal and environmental factors. The thorough literature review is informative and relevant, making it a strong contribution to sleep science. However, a more focused discussion on the practical applications of chronotype research in clinical settings could enhance its impact.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title, "Understanding the Human Chronotype," is suitable as it clearly conveys the subject matter of the manuscript. However, if you're looking for a title that is more specific and highlights the broader implications of the research, you might consider an alternative title: "The Role of Human Chronotypes in Health, Productivity, and Social Adaptation".</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, providing a good overview of the manuscript's key points, including the definition of chronotype, its variability, and its significance in modern society. However, I suggest adding a brief mention of the manuscript's focus on practical applications, such as how understanding chronotypes can improve workplace productivity and individual well-being. This would enhance the abstract by highlighting the real-world relevance of the research. Additionally, streamlining some of the descriptive details could make the abstract more concise and focused.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well-organized and logically flow from one topic to the next. Each section builds on the previous one, which helps in maintaining clarity and coherence. However, some subsections could be more concise to avoid redundancy. Additionally, integrating a dedicated section on practical applications or implications of the findings might enhance the manuscript's relevance to the reader.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive review of existing literature and its integration of both classic and contemporary studies on chronotypes. The methodology used to analyze the data and the references to established research add credibility to the findings. Additionally, the manuscript presents a balanced discussion of the genetic, environmental, and societal factors influencing chronotypes, which indicates a thorough understanding of the subject matter. The technical soundness is further supported by the accurate and consistent use of terminology throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references included in the manuscript are generally sufficient and draw from a wide range of studies, providing a solid foundation for the discussion. However, some of the references are slightly outdated, and incorporating more recent studies could enhance the manuscript's relevance. I suggest including recent research on the impact of chronotypes on modern work environments and mental health, which would provide a more up-to-date perspective on the topic.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language used in the manuscript is generally appropriate for scholarly communication. It is clear, precise, and effectively conveys the scientific concepts discussed. However, there are a few areas where the sentence structure could be refined for better readability. Minor grammatical adjustments and rephrasing in certain sections could enhance the overall fluency and ensure the manuscript meets the highest standards of academic writing.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a thorough exploration of chronotypes, offering valuable insights that could contribute significantly to the field. However, a more focused discussion on practical applications and a slight refinement of the language would further enhance its impact.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<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>
<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>Anatolii Tsarkov</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Zambia, Zambia</b>