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Reviewer's report:

The authors demonstrated that major depressed patients with objective insomnia (MDOI) showed a similar polysomnographic pattern to that of primary insomnia. Then they speculated that there was a potential common pathophysiology between MDOI and primary insomnia. This is a novel study with a good methodological design and clear results. However, I have two questions which should be addressed by the authors in the revised version of the manuscript.

1. The authors measured the subjective daytime sleepiness using the Epworth Sleepiness Scale. Unfortunately, I couldn't find the value of ESS in the Results section. It is well known that patients with major depression usually present significant daytime sleepiness. As the authors emphasized the possible pathophysiology of hyperarousal in patients with MDOI, I am interested in the result of ESS in these subjects.

2. In the discussion section, the authors explained some variables of PSG were the indirect marker of hyperarousal. Actually, the Multiple Sleep Latency Test (MSLT) is a valid measure of physiological arousal. They should refer some related study in the discussion and point this is a valid marker of hyperarousal which should be conducted in the future study.
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