**Notas do editor:**

**Com o objectivo de optimizar a legibilidade do seu artigo e assim  
incrementar potencialmente as citações do mesmo, recomendamos que os conteúdos redigidos em inglês sejam revistos por um "native speaker", tradutor qualificado ou empresa especializada em serviços de "language polishing".**

Estimado Editor,

Obrigado por considerar o nosso manuscrito.

O manuscrito foi reformulado de forma a incorporar as valiosas sugestões de ambos os revisores, bem como as correções de algumas gralhas que foram detetadas na anterior versão. As respostas individuais a cada comentário de cada revisor encontram-se neste documento.

Tal como sugeriu, o texto foi cuidadosamente revisto por um utilizador experiente da língua inglesa e acreditamos que a presente versão do manuscrito está mais clara, mais legível, e mais rigorosa em termos de língua inglesa.

**Revisor A:**

Dear Revisor,  
  
Once again, we are very thankful for your careful reading of our manuscript as well as for all your comments and suggestions. We reformulated our manuscript in order to incorporate your suggestions and corrected the mistakes that you have spotted. We will address your comments one by one.

**The Manuscript “Sleep habits among children from Mozambique and Cape Verde” maintains its relevance and prove the applicability of the  
Portuguese version of the Childrenʼs Sleep Habits Questionnaire in two Portuguese speaking African subpopulations. The authors completely and carefully reviewed the paper so only small comments arise from this version of the manuscript:**

**1. African countries instead of Africa?**

In the previous version of the manuscript we used “African countries” and “Africa” interchangeably in order to avoid the successive repetition of expressions. In order to avoid this unintended ambiguity, in the present version of the manuscript we decided to use “Africa” only when we were actually referring to the African continent. We now use “African countries” only when referring to Cape Verde and Mozambique simultaneously or to any other subgroup of countries from the African continent.

**2. Portuguese abstract: subestimam instead of sub estimam?**

We’re glad that you have spotted this typo. We incorporated this correction in the present version of the manuscript.

**3. The statistical section in methods should be shortened and reduced to relevant explanations that support the results instead of detailing the tests so much. In consequence I would advice to withdraw tables 3 and 4 because they do not help the future reader.**

The statistical subsection of the “methods” section has been shortened. Details regarding the statistical tests were reduced and we kept only the information that justifies our methodological choices and/or supports the validity of our findings. We believe that tables 3 and 4 are essential for the reader to be able to quickly check the estimated impact of each variable on the CSHQ, and whether or not that effect is statistically significant, without having to screen through all the text for particular pieces information (i.e., estimated effects and respective p-values). Both aforementioned tables are also important for the reader to know which variables are being controlled for in each regression, hence improving the interpretability of the coefficient estimates. Nevertheless, to improve readability we have reformulated and shortened tables 3 and 4. The columns respecting to coefficient standard errors and t-statistics were removed since they added little value to the tables. We kept only the two columns that are necessary for the reader to be able to check the estimated effect of each variable and the respective p-values, i.e., the “Estimate” and “P-value” columns. The number of decimal places in both tables was reduced from five to three digits. We have also removed the “significance stars” codes and the corresponding legends, and used the code “<0.001” for every p-value lower than 0.001 instead of displaying the actual p-value. P-values lower than 0.05 are now highlighted in bold font.

**Regarding priority in publication I would consider the manuscript within the first 20%.**

**Revisor B:**

Dear Revisor,  
  
Once again, we are very thankful for your careful reading of our manuscript as well as for all your comments and suggestions. We reformulated our manuscript in order to incorporate your suggestions and corrected the mistakes that you have spotted. We will address your comments one by one.

**The authors of "Sleep habits amongchildren from Mozambique and Cape Verde" have recently resubmitted their work to Acta Médica Portuguesa. I think the paper was very much improved and is much clearer. Nevertheless, I still  
have the following remarks to make to the new submitted version:**

**1. I asked for statistical tests to be performed in Table 1, so  
that a conclusion of different populations could be ascertained for the two studied samples. The authors have performed several tests for differences of proportions. This provides redundant p-values and is not adequate. For each subtable of table 1, the hypotheses test to be used has to be the  
chi-squared test; in this specific situation, it will test the homogeneity  
of proportions between rows. Remark: Consider for instance the subtable LocationxSex, in Table 1. As the column totals are fixed, the number of women in Cape Verde, say, uniquely determines the number of men. This implies that you only have to perform one test for this sub-table. Now, the test for the difference of proportions and the chi-squared test for this situation are equivalent and provide the same result.**

In the present version of the manuscript we conducted chi-squared homogeneity tests for each sub-table of table 1 instead of using a one-way test of differences in proportions for each level of each categorical variable like we did in the previous version of the manuscript. This table now includes only 6 p-values, one for each variable that is being compared across samples, except for mother nationality since the levels of this variable are not the same in the two samples. To improve readability, the disposition of this table has also been improved: father education and mother education now span over two different sub-tables instead of being aggregated in the same sub-table. We believe that table 1 is now cleaner and easier to interpret.

**2. Legend of table 1 has to be improved.**

The legend of table 1 has been improved. It now provides a more accurate description of the contents of the table.

**3. In section 2.3, please remove “To have formal evidence of  
such asymmetry we conducted the bootstrap symmetry test from Miao, Gel, and Gastwirth14 on each sample. The null hypothesis (symmetry) was rejected in both samples with p-values arbitrarily close to zero.” There is no need to perform such a test as only a description is being made. The symmetry of the distribution can to be assessed graphically, in order to avoid inflations in the final type-I error in the analysis. The lower the number of performed  
tests, the better.**

This sentence has been removed from the manuscript, as well as the reference that it contained. Instead of conducting this statistical test, we now present only each sample’s observed skewness coefficient, which were already included in the previous version of the manuscript.

**4. Table 3 and Table 4 – the numbers in the table have far too  
many decimal places. Your data do not give you that precision. Reduce the number of decimal places to 3, at most. Whenever a p-value is lower than 0.001, use “<0.001”. Moreover, delete “Signif. codes: 0 ‘\*\*\*ʼ 0.001 ‘\*\*ʼ 0.01 ‘\*ʼ 0.05 “ from below each table. It is enough to use boldface for the statistically significant p-values.**

Tables 3 and 4 have been reformulated in order to incorporate your suggestions. We reduced the number of decimal places to 3 digits. We have also removed the “significance stars” codes and the corresponding legends and used the code “<0.001” for p-values lower than 0.001 instead of displaying the actual p-values. P-values lower than 0.05 are now highlighted in bold font. To allow for better readability we have also removed the columns respecting to coefficient standard errors and t-statistics since they were of little added value to the future readers of the article. We kept only the columns that are necessary for the reader to be able to check the estimated effect of each variable and the respective p-values. We have also included the p-values from the F-test, Breusch-Pagan test, and Durbin-Watson test, that in the previous version of the manuscript were mentioned in the text but not included in tables 3 and 4 next to the respective test statistics. This will allow readers to have quick access to every result related to regression models without having to screen through all the text for particular pieces information.

**5. Tables 3 and 4: do you need all those variables in the  
regression? In your case, I recommend removing non-statistically significant variables from the table, except those that you need to control for or  
those that are near the 0.05-threshold. For instance, I would leave  
“taking a nap” in the table, as it has a category with an interesting  
p-value (0.9).**

Since sleep habits are known to have profound cultural influence, we believe that all the demographical variables that we have included in the regressions act as important controls even if they are not statistically significant, especially when assessing the impact of the items “bedtime TV” and “daytime napping”, because it made sense to include them in the first place and also because they expurgate the coefficient estimates of any potential confounding effect caused by demographical variables, which will allow the coefficient estimates (effects) to be interpreted with more confidence with respect to the variables of interest. In what respects to variable selection, our regression analysis is more descriptive than predictive and hence we decided to select the variables to include based on logical reasoning, favoring the inclusion of variables that typically (and according to the literature) are considered to have an impact on sleep habits rather than relying on statistically significance. Fitting another regression for each sample with only the statistically significant regressors would almost double the overall number of conducted t-tests and it would not assure that all the regressors in the new regressions would be statistically significant, which would require additional regressions to be fitted and even more t-tests to be conducted. We thought that it would be more transparent to stay with the original set of regressors since they were chosen prior to the experience and there was a rationale behind that choice, instead of experimenting several different combinations of regressors until a good fit with only statistically significant regressors is obtained, since this could result in the omission of many statistical tests that would have been conducted before the final models were reached. In what respects to the non-demographic variables, we decided to keep “Falls asleep while watching tv” in the CV regression model despite its p-values not being even close to any reasonable significance threshold because assessing whether or not this variable had an impact on the CSHQ score was one of the main goals of the regression analysis, and hence inclusion of this variable in table 3 is still informative despite not being statistically significant. Removing variables would also reduce the overall goodness-of-fit of the model.

**6. Regression Analysis Section; for the MZ sample, you should say “more than 11” (years of education), just as you say “more than 10”  
for the CV sample. For the MZ sample there is a typo in the 5th line: “... 11 or less years of education“**

We are glad that you have spotted both these typos. We have incorporated the respective corrections in the present version of the manuscript. Besides being present in the “Regression Analysis section”, the “more than 11” issue that you discovered was also present in the “discussion” section and it is now corrected.

**7. “Regarding to bedtime television, our model finds evidence  
that children who “sometimes” fall asleep while watching TV have CSHQ scores approximately 11% higher” - the 11% has to be 12%, once exp(-0.111)=1.12**

We were using the rule of thumb (Δ y)% ≈ (100\* β)Δx, where (Δ y)% is the percentual change in y and Δx is a small change in x. In order to incorporate your suggestion, we will tighten up our definition of “small change” and hence consider this approximation only for -0.1 < β < 0.1. For other values of β we will use the formula for the exact value, (Δ y)% = 100\*(exp(β)-1), which for the particular case of the 0.111 coefficient estimate that you mention will give approximately 12%.