

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research - New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1879
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sleep on Academic Performance among Nursing students-Najran University; KSA
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses an important topic but does not significantly advance our understanding of the relationship between sleep patterns and academic performance among nursing students. While the subject matter is relevant, the study's limited sample size and lack of longitudinal data weaken its impact. I find this manuscript lacks novelty and depth, as similar studies have been conducted with more comprehensive methodologies and larger samples.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Influence of Sleep on Academic Performance among Nursing Students-Najran University; KSA" is too verbose and could be more precise. An alternative title could be: "Impact of Sleep Patterns on Nursing Students' Academic Performance at Najran University, KSA."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is somewhat comprehensive but lacks critical details about the statistical methods used and the significance of the findings. It needs to clearly state the key results with specific p-values and effect sizes. For instance: "Chi-square tests indicated significant correlations between sleep duration and GPA (P < 0.05, OR = 1.41)." Furthermore, the conclusion should succinctly summarize the implications of the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and subsections of the manuscript are adequate but could be improved. The methodology section needs more detail regarding the sampling technique and data collection methods. Additionally, the discussion section should delve deeper into the implications of the findings and compare them more rigorously with existing literature.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, its robustness is questionable due to methodological limitations. The sample size of 60 students is too small to draw generalizable conclusions. The use of convenience sampling further introduces bias, reducing the study's validity. The statistical analysis, although appropriate, would benefit from more advanced techniques such as regression analysis to control for confounding variables.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	The references are somewhat adequate but lack recent and highly relevant sources. Many cited studies are outdated, and the manuscript would benefit from incorporating more recent research, particularly studies published in the last five years. Additionally, references on effective interventions to improve sleep among students would provide a more rounded perspective.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications but need improvement. There are several grammatical errors, awkward phrasings, and inconsistencies in terminology and style. Simplifying complex sentences, ensuring consistent use of terms, and thorough proofreading or professional editing are recommended to enhance clarity and readability.	
Optional/General comments	As the paper has already been published in a journal and is now being considered for publication as a book chapter, it is important to address copyright issues. • Copyright Transfer: Ensure that the authors have obtained permission from the journal where the paper was originally published to republish the content as a book chapter. This often involves a copyright transfer or obtaining a license to reuse the material. • Proper Attribution: The book chapter should include proper attribution to the original journal publication, including citation details, to acknowledge the initial source of the content. • Disclosure Statement: Recommend that the authors include a disclosure statement in the book chapter, indicating that the content was previously published in a specific journal and providing the relevant citation information.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdullah
Department, University & Country	Khyber Medical College, Pakistan