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 "**Open 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:
https://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.100340
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(1); e100340

Peer Review Report for "Design and Evaluation of a Mobile Application for Relapse Prevention to Methamphetamine Use Disorder"

Author(s): Reza Rabiei, Hamid Moghaddasi, Mina Heidari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 10 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 18 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 11 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
This is a good title, and most therapists in most countries are going this way. This method is suitable for the treatment of relapse of addiction. The article has value to print.
Thanks.

Fahimeh Fathali Lavasani: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 6 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Title:
- Remove evaluation from the title, because evaluating the app's content validity & its pilot on 5 patients is part of the design process
Abstract:
Mention:
- Background : relapse prevention instead of prevention of drug use
- Method: study design to be mentioned

Introduction
Mention:
- the literature review of methamphetamine abuse in Iran
Method:
Mention:
- Who are the major target group of this app?
- Have the target group characteristics been taken into account in the app design process?
- Has the app been tailored to the target group? How?
Conclusion:
- The conclusion needs major revision because a considerable part of this section is related to the review of research literature.
Mention:
- Discuss about the Results of this research
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Feb 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

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.

Reply to the reviewers

Reviewer # 1 Comments	**Responses**
Title: *Remove evaluation from title, because to evaluate app's content validity & its pilot on 5 patients is part of the design process*	Thank you **Title:** We did consider "design and evaluation" in the title, as the majority of similar papers in the field of medical informatics have used both terms to emphasis on both design of the information systems or applications and on the evaluation, to remark the significant role of evaluation beside design and development.
Abstract: *Mention:* *- Background : relapse prevention instead of prevention of drug use* *- Method: study design to be mentioned*	Thank you **Background**: the modification done in the background, as recommended. **Method:** clarifications added to the method (s) of the abstract, as we indicated that this applied and developmental study was conducted in two stages : software production (object-oriented analysis) and software evaluation (using quantitative approach)
Introduction *Mention:* *- the literature review of methamphetamine abuse in Iran*	Thank you Modifications done in the body of the manuscript and new supporting references were added to the bibliography section.
Method: *Mention:* *- Who are the major target group of this app?* *- Have the target group characteristics been taken into account in the app design process?* *- Has the app been tailored to the target group? How?*	Thank you A) The target group of the app are people with methamphetamine use, and the aim of the study was to design and produce a mobile app with the aim of methamphetamine relapse prevention. **B)** In software production stage, we did involve experts (clinical psychologists and exerts in addiction studies) to see how the relapse occurs and what the determinants are. Our notion was that the experts involved in this stage are well-informed about, and have appropriate knowledge of, relapse and factors associated with it.

	C) The evaluation of the app was then conducted with taking the views of both experts and patients into account. The aim was to tailor the app to the main target group (people with methamphetamine use) through improving the app in the next stage of development. However, further research is needed considering larger sample sizes for evaluation to study both the impact of the systems and the solutions for subsequent improvement.
Conclusion: *Conclusion needs major revision, because a considerable part of this section is related to the review of research literature.* *Mention:* *Discuss about the Results of this research*	Thank you We did our best to meet the very useful comment made by the respected reviewer. Corrections done and highlighted in the body of the manuscript.
Reviewer # 2 Comments	**Responses**
This is a good title, and most therapists in most countries are going this way. This method is suitable for the treatment of relapse of addiction. The article has value to print	Thank you very much for the kind words.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 18 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.