OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:

Peer Review

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope.89282
Published in: Health Scope: 8(2) ; e89282

Peer Review Report for "The Role of Optimism in Predicting Tobacco Smoking and Illicit Drug Use Among High School Students in Southeast of Iran, 2018"

Author(s): Hossein Ansari, Mohammad Khammarnia, Hassan Okati-Aliabad, Hossein Ansari, Neda Mahdavifar, Maryam Mohammadian, Ali Yousefzadeh, Abolfazl Mohammadbeigi, Younes Mohamadian, Kourosh Tirgarfakheri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	15 Jan 2019
Revised Date:	17 Feb 2019
Accepted Date:	7 Mar 2019

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh : Reviewer — 3 Feb 2019

Dear Editor,

The comments for this manuscript are as follows:

1. Why did the authors consider only grade 2 among high school students as the sample size?
2. How did the authors select 1094 students as the sample size? (Please write the sample size formula.)

3. Please explain more about “component analysis (PCA)” for determining the socioeconomic status.

Best Regards

Rahmatollah Moradzadeh : Reviewer

4 Feb 2019

Dear Editor:

The authors tried to investigate the relation between Optimism, as a personality factor, and Tobacco Smoking. I think this manuscript has been written very well, and the data has been presented in proper tables and charts. However, there are some points and suggestions as below:

1-The word “pessimism” could be removed from the title

2-The authors have claimed that “one to three high schools (as clusters or clusters) were selected randomly from each stratum”, but it must be mentioned which type of random sampling was used to select the schools?

3-In determining illicit drug use, the authors should specify the number of times. For example, somebody may be using opium or ecstasy. Do they classify as an illicit drug user??

4-Please mention the numbers in parentheses along with the percentages in the first paragraph of the results section

5-The authors could mention the words” Zahedan city” in the title of the tables.

6-Please put the sign”%” for all percents in the discussion

Salman Khazaei : Reviewer

5 Feb 2019

Dear Editor,
The Journal of Health Scope
The authors tried to investigate the relation between personality and smoking as well as substance abuse. I think this issue is too important among adolescents, and research in this regard is valuable. The manuscript has been written very well, and the data has been presented in proper tables and charts. However, there are some points and suggestions as below:
1. If possible, please depict your used Directed Acyclic Graph.
2. Please mention the numbers in parentheses along with the percentages in the first paragraph of the results section.
3. Why have the authors not included the parents' jobs in determining the SES level?

4. Please explain a bout figure 1 in at least one sentence.
5. The references number 17,19, and 21 should be revised.
Regards

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh : Associate Editor

10 Feb 2019

Dear Editor,

The first peer review process of the manuscript is finished. According to the reviewer's comments, the manuscript needs "Minor Revision".

Best Regards

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

10 Feb 2019

Dear author:

According to the reviewer's comments, the manuscript needs "Minor Revision".

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear Editor-In-Chief

The Journal of Health Scope

We greatly appreciate your efforts you and the respected reviewers, for the comments, which have helped us to improve our manuscript entitled" The Role of Optimism and Pessimism in Predicting Tobacco Smoking and Illicit Drugs Use among High School Students in Southeast of Iran, 2018." We have revised our manuscript according to the reviewer comments. A point-to-point response is as follows:

Reviewer No. 1 comments:

The comments for this manuscript are as follows:

1. Why did the authors consider only grade 2 among high school students as the sample size?

Author response: This study is longitudinal and has carried out in two stages. This manuscript has been extracted from the data of the first stage of the present project. As the researchers wanted to assess the students again in the next year, to prevent attrition, the authors considered only grade 2 among high school students. However, the students in grade 2 are not going to graduate, and the probability of transportation to another school is very low.

2. How did the authors select 1094 students as the sample size? (Please write the sample size formula.)

Author response: Done.

The sample size formula was added to the materials and methods section.

3. Please explain more about "component analysis (PCA)" for determining the socioeconomic status.

Author response: Done.

We explained more about "component analysis (PCA).

Reviewer No. 2 comments:

The authors tried to investigate the relation between Optimism, as a personality factor, and Tobacco Smoking. I think this manuscript has been written very well, and the data has been presented in proper tables and charts. However, there are some points and suggestions as below:

1-The word “pessimism” could be removed from the title.

Author response: Done.

2-The authors have claimed that “one to three high schools (as cluster or clusters) were selected randomly from each stratum”, but it must be mentioned which type of random sampling was used to select the schools?

Author response: Done.

The authors mentioned to type of random sampling

3-In determining illicit drug use, the authors should specify the number of times. For example, somebody may be using opium or ecstasy. Do they classify as an illicit drug user?

Author response: Done.

The authors mentioned to number of times. Yes, as mentioned in the materials and methods section, the students who used opium or ecstasy were also classified as illicit drug users.

4-Please mention the numbers in parentheses along with the percentages in the first paragraph of the results section

Author response: Done.

5-The authors could mention the words” Zahedan city” in the title of the tables.

Author response: Done.

6-Please put the sign”%” for all percent’s in the discussion

Author response: Done.

Reviewer No. 3 comments:

The authors tried to investigate the relation between personality and smoking as well as substance abuse. I think this issue is too important among adolescents, and research in this regard is valuable. The manuscript has been written very well, and the data has been presented in proper tables and charts. However, there are some points and suggestions as below:

1. If possible, please depict your used Directed Acyclic Graph.

Author response: A Directed Acyclic Graph is usually used to determine the main confounders, and presenting a DAG is not standard in the articles.

2. Please mention the numbers in parentheses along with the percentages in the first paragraph of the results section.

Author response: Done

3. Why have the authors not included the parents' jobs in determining the SES level?

Author response: We used the assets of the households to determine the SE, S, and the assets are partly a proxy of parents' jobs. So, to decrease the parameters of the model, we did not include the parents' jobs in determining the SES level

4. Please explain a bout figure 1 in at least one sentence.

Author response: Done

5. The references number 17, 19, and 21 should be revised.

Author response: Done

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Rahmatollah Moradzadeh : Reviewer — 26 Feb 2019

Dear Editor:

The authors have revised the manuscript based on the comments.

Best regards,

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh : Associate Editor — 2 Mar 2019

Dear Editor,
The second peer review process of the manuscript is finished. According to the reviewer's comment, the decision for this manuscript is "Accept".

Best Regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 7 Mar 2019

Dear author,

The second peer review process of the manuscript is finished. According to the reviewer's comment, the decision for this manuscript is "Accept".

Best Regards,