COMMENTS OF THE REVIEWER AND RESPONSES

COMMENT-1: Only one sentence is written under ‘Background’ in abstract. The justification for the study should be written precisely in the section.

RESPONSE-1: The following sentences have been added to the existing background of the study: Cyclic meditation (CM) is a technique in which yoga postures are interspersed with periods of supine rest in recurring cycles. Earlier studies have shown that CM is a potent stress reduction strategy with facilitated cognitive performance. Such mind-modifying practiced during the day may influence night – time sleep. Hence, the present study aimed at studying quality of sleep following the practice of CM and supine rest.

COMMENT-2: The abstract is placed before the contents. It should be the other way.

RESPONSE-2: As per the University norms, a candidate is expected to write ‘Abstract’ before the content page.

COMMENT-3: In contents, ‘Deep sleep’ is wrongly mentioned as ‘Depp sleep’ and ‘calibrating’ as ‘callibrating’.

RESPONSE-3: These errors in the content pages are regretted and corresponding corrections have been incorporated.

COMMENT-4: Page no.4, last line quotes the reference ‘Sarang & Telles, 2006’. Actually there are three references by the same author in 2006 (marked as 2006a, 2006b and 2006c) in the references section. It should be mentioned which among these is quoted.

RESPONSE-4: Quoting the reference ‘Sarang & Telles, 2006’ in page number 4, last line was a mistake. Currently this reads as ‘an increase in the P300 event related potential amplitude following the practice (Sarang & Telles, 2006c), also suggestive of enhanced sustained and selective attention’.
COMMENT-5: Pages 87 to 102, Tables 3.4.1 to 3.4.14, provide a summary of information on studies involving various types of meditation (Transcendental, Yoga, Zen, etc). It is prudent to mention the duration for which the subject practiced the meditation. The table would have been made more informative by providing the number of meditations and controls in each study (wherever applicable) rather than the total sample size.

RESPONSE-5: All the tables between Pages 87 and 102 have been made informative by providing the number of subjects in both experimental & control groups and the duration of practice by the subjects.

COMMENT-6: The text in page 105, mentions the sample size as 30 and the number of subjects did not vary across the variables studied. But the table in the same page mentions the sample size as 40 for the variable ‘Autonomic, respiratory & heart rate variability’. In page 106, Table 5.1.2 provides the baseline characteristics of 40 subjects. In page 109, Figure 5.2 illustrates the flow of participants and mentions that 50 subjects are randomized. The discrepancy in sample size should be explained.

RESPONSE-6: Mentioning the sentence ‘the number of subjects did not vary across the variables studied’ was a mistake. Currently this mistake has been rectified in all the tables. In fact the effect size of both the trials was different and the sample size was calculated based on the previous study. Accordingly the sample sizes are as follows:

- Polysomnography measures (n)-30
- Heart rate variability measures (n)-40

COMMENT-7: Figure 5.2 mentions that 50 subjects are randomized. But the method of randomization is not mentioned anywhere. This needs to be explained.
RESPONSE-7: A separate paragraph has been added under the sub-heading 5.1.6: Randomization.

COMMENT-8: Most of the figures (bar diagrams) in the results section do not have either the legend or units for the variables in y axis.

RESPONSE-8: Mistakes of not writing either the legend or units in y axis are regretted and appropriate legends and units have been incorporated in all the bar graphs.

COMMENT-9: Figures 7.1.8, 7.1.9, 7.1.11, 7.2.1 to 7.2.5, 7.3.3 to 7.3.8 indicate an asterisk (*) symbol. But the explanation for it is not provided in the foot note of the respective figures.

RESPONSE-9: Explanation for all the asterisks are now given in the foot notes for respective figures. Bar graph having single asterisk has been explained as *p<0.05, double asterisks as **p<0.01 and triple as ***p<0.001 in the foot notes.