OPEN PEER REVIEW

## Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

## What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

## Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope-123801
Published in: Health Scope: 11(2); e123801

# Peer Review Report for "Effects of Sleep Quality on Academic Performance and Psychological Distress Among Medical Students in Saudi Arabia"

**Author(s):** Noara Khaled Alhusseini, Majed Ramadan, Yazan Almasry, Miral Atout, Khaled Hamsho, Mariam Mahmoud, Sara Alnasser, Ismail Shakir

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Mar 2022
Revised Date: 8 May 2022
Accepted Date: 27 May 2022

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**Maryam Seraji**: Reviewer | Revision (0) 7 Apr 2022

Dear Associate Editor
, please
Abstract: 1. Features of the questionnaire
2. Validity and reliability of questionnaires
3. Keywords MESH
4. Complete the code of ethics with Hapir Link
Introduction: 5. What is the need to conduct a study in the study area?
6. At least one similar study should be mentioned in the introduction, emphasizing the need for the study
7. Validity and reliability of the Pisburgh Sleep Quality Questionnaire?
8. Validity and reliability of the Psychological Distress Questionnaire?
9. How many academic years were the academic performance compared?
10. No difference in sleep pattern in terms of gender? Also in the discussion?
11. In Table 1, the marital status should be corrected according to other cases
12. In Table 2 of the employment status, the full-time job does not have a numerical report.

13. In the discussion the reasons for similarity and lack of connection with other studies should be added.
14. Reference 3 according to the pattern of the journal
15. The translation should be edited and native

**Amir Nasiri**: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 10 Apr 2022

This article fits the scope of the Health Scope Journal. The present study aimed to identify and understand the correlation between the quality of sleep, and performance academic, and psychological distress among medical students. The topic is so interesting nowadays. The present paper has been written in a well-structured way in literature. It also requires grammatical revision. However, below are some points and suggestions that could improve this article.

Title
Comments:
a. Correct the title of the article.
The effects of sleep quality on academic performance and psychological distress among medical students in Saudi Arabia

Abstract
Comment:
a. The purpose of the study is not properly stated in the introduction

Background
Comments:
a. The justification of the study is not clear.
b. The background should also include other studies in this area and literature not done well in this sector.

Methodology
Comments:
More information and details on the measures would have been helpful
a. Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
b. The materials & methods section is relatively immature. You could expand it a bit more clearly for readers. For example, write about the sample size. How did you calculate the sample size for this survey?
c. Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding
d. Explain how missing data were addressed
e. Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analyzed
f. Is the validity and reliability of the measurement tool in Saudi Arabia calculated beforehand?

Discussion

Comment:

a. Discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results

**Zahra Sharafi**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 17 Apr 2022

Thank you for your article. you should edit your article and submit it again with good English and clear phrasing.

thanks.

**Fariba Shahraki Sanavi**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Apr 2022

Dear Authors

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

This article fits the scope of the Health Scope Journal. The present study aimed to identify and understand the correlation between the quality of sleep, and performance academic, and psychological distress among medical students. The topic is so interesting nowadays. The present paper has been written in a well-structured way in literature. It also requires grammatical revision. However, below are some points and suggestions that could improve this article.

Title Comments:

a. Correct the title of the article.

The effects of sleep quality on academic performance and psychological distress among medical students in Saudi Arabia

Abstract Comment:

a. The purpose of the study is not properly stated in the introduction

Background

Comments:

a. The justification of the study is not clear.

b. The background should also include other studies in this area and literature not done well in this sector.

Methodology Comments:

More information and details on the measures would have been helpful

a. Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias

b. The materials & methods section is relatively immature. You could expand it a bit more clearly for readers. For example, write about the sample size. How did you calculate the sample size for this survey?

c. Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding

d. Explain how missing data were addressed

e. Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analyzed

f. Is the validity and reliability of the measurement tool in Saudi Arabia calculated beforehand?

Discussion Comment:

a. Discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results.

Reviewer 2:

Abstract:

1. Features of the questionnaire
2. Validity and reliability of questionnaires
3. Keywords MESH
4. Complete the code of ethics with Hapir Link

Introduction:

5. What is the need to conduct a study in the study area?
6. At least one similar study should be mentioned in the introduction, emphasizing the need for the study

Methodology:

7. Validity and reliability of the Pisburgh Sleep Quality Questionnaire?
8. Validity and reliability of the Psychological Distress Questionnaire?
9. How many academic years were the academic performance compared?

Result:

10. No difference in sleep pattern in terms of gender? Also in the discussion?
11. In Table 1, the marital status should be corrected according to other cases
12. In Table 2 of the employment status, the full-time job does not have a numerical report.

Discussion:

13. In the discussion the reasons for similarity and lack of connection with other studies should be added.
14. Reference 3 according to the pattern of the journal
15. The translation should be edited.

Reviewer 3:

Thank you for your article. you should edit your article and submit it again with good English and clear phrasing.

Regards

**Ramazan Mirzaei**: EIC | **Revision (0)** 27 Apr 2022

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs “Major revision”.

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

## Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reviewer 1:
Thank you for your article. ~~it is better you~~you should edit your article and submit it again with good English and clear phrasing.
thanks. We did a major revision and editing. Thank you
Reviewer 2:
This article fits the scope of the Health Scope Journal. The present study aimed to identify and understand the correlation between the quality of sleep, and performance academic, and psychological distress among medical students. The topic is so interesting nowadays. The present paper has been written in a well-structured way in literature. It also requires grammatical revision. However, below are some points and suggestions that could improve this article.

Title
Comments:
a. Correct the title of the article.
The effects of sleep quality on ~~the~~ academic performance and psychological distress among medical students in Saudi Arabia
Done thank you

Abstract
Comment:
a. The purpose of the study is not properly stated in the introduction
Corrected.

Background
Comments:
a. The justification of the study is not clear. Added
b. The background should also include other studies in this area and literature not done well in this sector. Done

Methodology
Comments:
More information and details on the measures would have been helpful
a. Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias--corrected
b. The materials & methods section is relatively immature. You could expand it a bit more clearly for readers. For example, write about the sample size. How did you calculate the sample size for this survey? added
c. Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding
d. Explain how missing data were addressed and added
e. Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analyzed (This is a cross--sectional study, no follow--up was administrated in the study, eligibility was applied by default as out participants were all from the University only)
f. Is the validity and reliability of the measurement tool in Saudi Arabia calculated beforehand? Added

Discussion
Comment:
a. Discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results added
Reviewer 3:
Dear Associate Editor
please
Abstract: 1. Features of the questionnaire added
2. Validity and reliability of questionnaires added
3. Keywords MESH added already
4. Complete the code of ethics with Hapir Link can you please share the link? ~~added but not sure if this is the one they refereeing t~~o ~~(It~~'s listed immediately after the abstract)~~

Introduction: 5. What is the need to conduct a study in the study area? added
6. At least one similar study should be mentioned in the introduction, emphasizing the need for the study added
7. Validity and reliability of the Pisburgh Sleep Quality Questionnaire? added
8. Validity and reliability of the Psychological Distress Questionnaire? added
9. How many academic years were the academic performance compared? Added in methods
~~The indicator for academic performance in our study is the current GPA regardless of what academic year is the student in. AThe academic year variable in the study was used as a demographic independent variable. The variable was not significant predictors based on the backward elimination selection method we used. So, it was not included in the final model for comparison.~~
10. No difference in sleep pattern in terms of gender? Also in the discussion? done~~(Noura you need to add a few sentences in the discussion for the following finding from our result section (There was a statistically significant difference between males and females in reporting sleep quality scores (*P* value<.0001).)~~
11. In Table 1, the marital status should be corrected according to other cases I don't understand, what other cases the reviewer is refereeing to? Please clarify

12. In Table 2 of the employment status, the full-time job does not have a numerical report~~?~~.
If you mean estimate, then it's there in the table. No other numerical report should be added ~~for~~to this table. Please clarify.

| Employment status | Estimate [1] | SThe standard error (SE) | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, I have a full-time job | -1.15 | 0.35 | 0.001 |
| Yes, I have a part-time job | (Ref) | (Ref) | (Ref) |
| No | -0.02 | 0.08 | 0.73 |

13. In the discussion ~~of~~ the reasons for similarity and lack of connection with other studies should be added.
14. Reference 3 according to the pattern of the journal all references are inserted via endnote to match the required format
15. The translation should be edited and native everything is in English

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Authors
Reviewers' Comments:
~~Reviewer 1:~~
~~This article fits the scope of the Health Scope Journal. The present study aimed to identify and understand the correlation between the quality of sleep, and performance academic, and psychological distress among medical students. The topic is so interesting nowadays. The present paper has been written in a well-structured way in literature. It also requires grammatical revision. However, below are some points and suggestions that could improve this article.~~
~~Title Comments:~~
~~a. Correct the title of the article.~~
~~The effects of sleep quality on the academic performance and psychological distress among medical students in Saudi Arabia~~
~~Abstract Comment:~~
~~a. The purpose of the study is not properly stated in the introduction~~
~~Background~~
~~Comments:~~
~~a. The justification of the study is not clear.~~
~~b. The background should also include other studies in this area and literature not done well in this sector.~~

*Methodology Comments:*
*More information and details on the measures would have been helpful*
*a. Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias*
*b. The materials & methods section is relatively immature. You could expand it a bit more clearly for readers. For example, write about the sample size. How did you calculate the sample size for this survey?*
*c. Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding*
*d. Explain how missing data were addressed*
*e. Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analyzed*
*f. Is the validity and reliability of the measurement tool in Saudi Arabia calculated beforehand?*
*Discussion Comment:*
*a. Discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results.*
*Reviewer 2:*
*Abstract:*
*1. Features of the questionnaire*
*2. Validity and reliability of questionnaires*
*3. Keywords MESH*
*4. Complete* the *code of ethics with Hapir Link*
*Introduction:*
*5. What is the need to conduct a study in the study area?*
*6. At least one similar study should be mentioned in the introduction, emphasizing the need for* the *study*
*Methodology:*
*7. Validity and reliability of the Pisburgh Sleep Quality Questionnaire?*
*8. Validity and reliability of the Psychological Distress Questionnaire?*
*9. How many academic years were the academic performance compared?*
*Result:*
*10. No difference in sleep pattern in terms of gender? Also in the discussion?*
*11. In Table 1, the marital status should be corrected according to other cases*
*12. In Table 2 of the employment status, the full-time job does not have a numerical report*?.
*Discussion:*
*13. In the discussion* of *the reasons for similarity and lack of connection with other studies should be added.*
*14. Reference 3 according to the pattern of the journal*
*15. The translation should be edited.*
*Reviewer 3:*
*Thank you for your article.* ~~it is better you~~*you should edit your article and submit it again with good English and clear phrasing.*
*Regards*

**OPEN PEER REVIEW**

**Revision (1)**

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**Maryam Seraji**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 14 May 2022

please
Comments are done correctly and with high accuracy and can be accepted and published

**Zahra Sharafi**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 16 May 2022

Dear EIC:
The author has modified the article according to my comments and this article is suitable for publishing in the journal of health scope.

**Amir Nasiri**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 18 May 2022

Changes have been made

**Fariba Shahraki Sanavi**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 May 2022

Dear Authors
Reviewers' Comments:
Comments are done correctly and with high accuracy and can be accepted.

**Ramazan Mirzaei**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 27 May 2022

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, we congratulate you that your article has been accepted for publication in this journal. If you fulfill your other obligations, your article will be published in this journal.
Kind regards