Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Volume 19 · Issue 4 · e118830
OPEN PEER REVIEW

Study of Effective Factors in the Tendency of Young People to Smoke Hookah in Teahouses in Deprived Areas of Zahedan in 2018 - 2019

Badpa Khaled, Mohammad Ali Fardin

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
20 Aug 2021	11 Nov 2021	12 Nov 2021	10.5812/amh.118830

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 5
Authors' reply to reviewers 6
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

3 comments · 1 Sep 2021 – 15 Sep 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 1 Sep 2021

1- The manuscript contains numerous grammatical and typographical errors, some of which have been indicated in the manuscript.
2- The manuscript states that 75 questionnaires were distributed and 300 were collected!!!!
3-The title indicates that the main objective of the study is to examine the motivation for smoking hookah, but this topic receives very little attention in the manuscript. The title does not match the content of the manuscript.
4-Were the questions examining the motivation for smoking hookah at these establishments developed by the authors or taken from a source? Please provide a reference.
5-The tables are not presented in a standard format and are unclear. They require substantial revision.
6-The findings on the relationship between the duration and frequency of hookah smoking and the motivation for smoking hookah are not clearly presented in the Results section and are difficult to understand. It would have been better to also report the relationship between participants' education level and the duration of hookah smoking and the frequency of hookah smoking per day.
7-The findings from the selected study population cannot be generalized to the entire population of Zahedan because this study was conducted only in the city's teahouses. Large segments of the population, such as women, do not visit these establishments to smoke hookah. In the first paragraph of the Discussion, the author has generalized the findings to all adults in Zahedan.
8-The final sentences of the Discussion state: " High hookah consumption in Zahedan is due to .....". Which study has reported the prevalence of hookah smoking in Zahedan and shown that it is higher than in other parts of Iran? Please provide a reference.
9-Did all the patrons of these teahouses really have at least a high school diploma?

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 11 Sep 2021

Thank you for this opportunity to review your article. Please see my comments as follows:
Title:
page No:1 Line NO:1 Our suggestions
Because it is a cross-sectional-analytical study, I think this title is better:
Investigating the factors affecting the tendency to use hookah in deprived areas
OR
The investigation of the factors affecting the tendency to use hookah in deprived areas
abstract:
1. The Background section is required in the abstract.
2. Please use objectives instead of "objective".
3. Objectives: The aim was to determine the factors affecting the tendency to use and motivation to use hookah.
4. Methods:
1. Type of research study.
2. The third and fourth lines of the method section are incomprehensible.

3. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire should be reported.
4. Please use Conclusions instead of "Conclusion".
5. The label "Mesh Heading" is necessary.
Introduction
page No:2 Line NO: 25
This line does not support the preceding or following sentence and is irrelevant.
page No:2 Line NO: 43
There is no explanation about the deprived area in the background section.
page No:2 Line NO: 46
Please correct the aim.
If the researcher is examining the factors affecting the tendency of youth to use hookah, it is suggested that the word youth be mentioned in the title. This is because, in the introduction section, the researcher regularly refers to young people. However, the sample also includes middle-aged groups.
Methods
page No: 2 Line NO:49
Please use methods instead of " Materials and methods ".
page No: 2 Line NO:50
1. Explain the type of study.
2. The study population is not described.
3. Is there no common hookah house in Zahedan? The sample includes only males, while hookah use is also seen in females. Have the researchers not done anything about it?
page No: 3 Line NO:65
1. What are the eligibility criteria?
Being at least 15 years old BUT
Adolescence has a certain age range that is not defined in the inclusion criteria.
2. Code of Ethics?
3. Explain the biographical information of the study.
page No: 3 Line NO:72
1. Was the questionnaire developed, and were its validity and reliability assessed? PLEASE EXPLAIN.
2. Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias.
Results:
page No: 4 Line NO:101
1. Modify table number one.
2. Why were the participants not asked about their occupations?
Discussion
page No: 5 Line NO:120-124
1. Provide a more complete interpretation of the results.
page No: 5 Line NO:154
Provide further interpretation in the discussion.
Limitations:
There were no female participants.

Funding:
Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 15 Sep 2021

Major revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

The authors did not provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments in this round.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 6 Nov 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 6 Nov 2021

minor revision

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

The authors did not provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments in this round.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 12 Nov 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 12 Nov 2021

accept