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Reviewer's report:

The paper address an important clinical issue and the research results should have clinical implications. The sample size is big, although it was an cross-section design. However there are some limitations and need to be addressed.

1. In the introduction part, the importance of the study haven't been well illustrated, and need more literature review to support the hypotheses. Such as why such study is important and the relevance to clinical treatment and relapse prevention? how your hypotheses generated? is there any literature support?

2. In the method part, more information are needed to explain the study procedure.

   (1) For example, why choose Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index as the main survey tool? how it will been scored, why choose 5 scores as the cut off scores for sleep disorder? is there any literature support for that? is that reasonable and acceptable?

   (2) The IRB approval number should be provided.

   (3) More information are needed to describe the patients group and control group. The data are come from other study? if yes, please provide more information about the study aim, design, etc. Which stage the patients were? is the patients still use drugs? or abstinence for how long? more information are needed to describe the patients, such as drug history, use method, comorbidity, poly drug use status, etc. These information are very important for to explain the results.

   (4) For control groups, should describe the detail recruit process, sources, are they from community or other places? they are health controls or other groups?

3. In the results part: it will be helpful to compare the general information between two groups. It will be also helpful to analyses other factors associated with sleep disorders. The table should be revised as required by the Journal. Why the PSQI have two cut off scores(> 5 and >8)? did the author also compare the difference among different type of drugs ( in tables 3)? if not, it will be helpful to do that.

4. The discussion part need to be revised a lot. The author only describe the main findings, didn't illustrate the possible reasons and how it will be used in clinical work.

5. the literature was a little bit out of date, more recent literature should be added.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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