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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: This is a cross-sectional descriptive study of the associations between symptoms of sleep and digestive dysfunction. The work is generally well written (though it will benefit from a thorough proofreading) and concisely described. Both sleep and digestive health are important issues that affect a large proportion of the population, and the relations between them have been relatively under-addressed, so the paper addresses a significant issue. The authors have used well-validated subjective instruments for symptom self-report in a relatively large study sample. The conclusions are based on the findings and may be valuable for implementing improved standard of care among practicing physicians, even if causal deductions cannot be drawn. Nevertheless, there is room for improvement, and I offer several non-trivial suggestions toward further strengthening this interesting report.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Introduction: This section is relatively unfocused for the first page or so. The general information about sleep disorders prevalence is confusing insofar as specific sleep disorders were not measured in this study. A single sentence regarding the global epidemiology of generally inadequate/disordered sleep would suffice, allowing the main focus to rest on the relationships between sleep and GI symptoms.

Methods:

Few details are provided regarding the larger study. Basic information is needed, such as recruitment methods and context (were these all patients at a GI and/or sleep clinic, or from the general population?), response rates, methods of survey administration, etc.

It is unclear whether the PSQI or GSRS were completed in their original English versions or translated (and if so, whether this was done appropriately) into Korean.
It is unclear why the PSQI cutoff of 5 was used (a reference is provided, but a rationale should be provided).

The National Sleep Foundation (which has a strong conflict of interest with commercial markets and does not use sound data collection methods) recommendations are a poor choice for categorizing sufficient/insufficient sleep.

No psychometrics are provided for the GSRS.

The statement "Continuous variables were categorized as appropriate categorical variables based on their distributions." is unclear; a cutoff is provided for the global PSQI and sleep duration by age, but for none of the other measures.

It is unclear why the covariates were chosen (e.g., IV's differing on univariate analyses).

Results: Inclusion of effect size information for all statistically significant findings (i.e., in the tables) would help strengthen the report considerably.

Discussion: The authors generally summarize the previous literature and then state that none of it is comparable to their own findings. This may be strictly true, but some aspects (e.g., age findings, sex differences) can and should be discussed in the context of what is currently known on the topics.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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