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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.100909
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 10(1); e100909

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Combined Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) with Mindfulness on Negative Emotions and Craving in Adolescents with Methamphetamine Dependence"

Author(s): Jaber Alizadehgoradel

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	5 Feb 2020
Revised Date:	31 Aug 2020
Accepted Date:	16 Dec 2020

Revision (0)

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

Roghieh Nooripour: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Please look at the attached file.
Please review after the requested changes/corrections.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 18 May 2020

Dear AE,
Results are incomplete and as a result, the discussion is incomplete.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 27 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by

the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
They should consider:
the limitation
ethical consideration
the digits related to results
regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 May 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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 Reviewers

Reviewer#1:

Background

1. The introduction to the article should summarize two questions: Does the article address an important issue? Has this research question been asked before? What is research innovation and highlight the research innovation aspect? Explain the reason for combining these two approaches. In the last paragraph, state the unresolved issues and the research gap and the direct and indirect applications of this study. It is important to state how the results of this study can help dispel ambiguities.

Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the end of the introduction has been added.

Method

1) Please state the ethical considerations of the research. Sampling requires further explanation and clarification.

Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the method section.

2) Describe the sessions and the references for mindfulness carefully for present sample.

Response: Thank you so much for the comment:The mindfulness protocol was described in Table 1.

3) Express Cronbach's alpha for each instrument:

Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the Instruments section.

Results

1) Before presenting the tables, the demographic characteristics of the participants should be expressed in the form of a paragraph:

Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the Results section.

Discussion

1. In this section, a summary of the findings should be mentioned, and their interpretation and description should be discussed.

2. The consistency and inconsistency of the findings with the findings of previous similar studies should be compared and examined and explained

   Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the this section.

3. Then, the general and practical conclusion and generalizability of the results and in general the presentation of what has been added to the existing theoretical and applied knowledge from this research should be mentioned.

   Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the this section.

4. In order to express the limitations of the research and to present research and applied suggestions for further studies.

   Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the this section.

Reviewer#2:

Background

- Philosophy to combine tDCS and MBSAT as an intervention:
  Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the this section: "One hypothesis that can be said is that combining mindfulness therapy with electrical stimulation can have synergistic effects"

- Self- Medication hypothesis for explaining the role of psychological distress in substance abuse and craving:

  Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the this section:

Method

- To Specify research groups
  Response: Thank you so much for the comment: The groups were identified.

- Sample size formula
  Response: Thank you so much for the comment: The number of samples was selected based on previous research.

- How are the exclusion criteria assessed?
  Response: Thank you so much for the comment: Using a clinical interview.

- DDQ is developed for heroin use. In Iran, the validity & reliability of DDQ is assessed for crystalline- heroin. Thus, mention:DDQ' psychometric properties for methamphetamine.
  Response: Thank you so much for the comment: This questionnaire was administered to different groups, including methamphetamine, and the study sample was mentioned in this section

- Sham group used for clinical trial of surgical interventions, not psychological interventions

Response: Thank you so much for the comment: sham is used in all research related to TDCS instead of the control group.

Results

- Between- group comparisons:

  Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the this section:

Discussion

- This is incomplete, because intergroup comparisons have not been discussed.

Mention:

Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the this section:

- limitations

  Response: Thank you so much for the comment: the The required items were added in the this section:

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 29 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for the revision and the requested corrections have been made.
Thank you!

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 7 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript has been reviewed:
If the comments are applied in the article, it is acceptable.
*The certificate has been uploaded in the Review section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 Dec 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Dec 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.