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.103877
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(3); e103877

Peer Review Report for "Innovative Equine Facilitated Psychotherapy Intervention for Adolescent Addiction Treatment: A Pilot Study"

Author(s): William Leigh Atherton, Cheryl C Meola, Kenneth S Pritchard

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 4 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 5 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

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

Mohsen Khosravi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 May 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for inviting me to review the manuscript. The manuscript entitled "Innovative Equine Facilitated Psychotherapy Intervention for Adolescent Addictions Treatment: A Pilot Study" covers an interesting topic. While I think the manuscript has something to offer, it would benefit from a more thorough subedit. I have a number of comments to be addressed.
1. Abstract-Conclusion, make sure it is aligned with the aim of the study followed by implications of your study and recommendations for future studies.
2. “Introduction” sections of the articles are like gates of a city. It is a presentation aiming at introducing itself to the readers, and attracting their attention. In another word, the “Introduction” section must be included: “What we know”, “What we don’t know” and “Aims”. In this paper, it is important to further develop and expand the Equine Facilitated Psychotherapy (please see: Vidrine, M., Owen-Smith, P., & Faulkner, P., 2002).
3. Generally the length of the discussion section should not exceed the sum of other sections (introduction, material and methods, and results), and it should be completed within 6-7 paragraphs. Additionally, each paragraph should not contain more than 200 words. In this paper, the discussion is written briefly and vaguely.
4. Conclusions are too short so that the overall conclusions do not rise to the level of conceptual advance.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

23 May 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript title is important and related to the JHRB.
It is suggested that
- The including and excluding criteria and also ethical code must be added in the procedure section.
- Sample size is small , I think using non parametric test is more appropriate for analyzing the data.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

11 Jun 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)

11 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
Please answer the comments one by one in reply to reviewers file. highlight the changes in main file. reconsider: the ethical considerations,digits and limitations in article.
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.

Manuscript ID: 103877
Title: Innovative Equine Facilitated Psychotherapy Intervention for Adolescent Addictions Treatment: A Pilot Study

Table of Revisions

Reviewers' Comment	Authors' Response
R1. Abstract-Conclusion make sure it is aligned with the aim of the study followed by implications of your study and recommendations for future studies.	• Abstract-Objective section was modified to better reflect the 'aim of the study', which helps align the Abstract-Conclusion section with the study aim. • Recommendations for future studies was added to the Abstract-Conclusion section.
R1. "Introduction" sections of the articles are like gates of a city. It is a presentation aiming at introducing itself to the readers and attracting their attention. In other word, the "Introduction" section must be included: "What we know", "What we don't know" and "Aims". In this paper, it is important to further develop and expand the Equine Facilitated Psychotherapy (please see: Vidrine, M., Owen-Smith, P., & Faulkner, P., 2002).	• Additional paragraphs were added within the Introduction section that expanded the exploration of current knowledge/research related to EFP and adolescent addiction treatment. • Additional references were added within these sections to add to the literature review of EFP and adolescent addiction. The recommended reference was more appropriate for inclusion in the Discussion section.
R1. Generally, the length of the discussion section should not exceed the sum of other sections (introduction, material and methods, and results), and it should be completed within 6-7 paragraphs. Additionally, each paragraph should not contain more than 200 words. In this paper, the discussion is written briefly and vaguely.	• Discussion section paragraphs were expanded, connecting and exploring results of the current study through relation to previous literature. • Where appropriate, additional references were added to improve the expansion of Discussion section.
R1. Conclusions are too short so that the overall conclusions do not rise to the level of conceptual advance.	• Clarification was added within the Discussion section to highlight the advances to EFP knowledge, and adolescent addictions treatment knowledge
R2. The including and excluding criteria and also ethical code must be added in procedure section.	• Inclusion/exclusion criteria were added to the 'procedure' section. • Section 3.4 Ethics was moved to a subheading (3.2.2) under 'procedure' as requested.
R2. Sample size is small, I think using non-parametric test is more appropriate for analyzing the data.	• The authors considered this recommendation and decided to remain with paired-sample t-tests. Non-parametric tests are appropriate when the sample size is small *and* there is data is not normally

	distributed. We reviewed our data set and determined the data to be normally distributed. Further, when examining the distribution, it was apparent the Mean was a far better descriptor of the data curve than the Median, which was more skewed from center. When deciding whether to use a non-parametric test, it is recommended that the Mean and Median be reviewed to determine which is a better descriptor. If the Median is better, then non-parametric is a better choice. If the Mean is better, parametric is more appropriate. It is for these reasons we decided to keep the parametric statistic.

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)** 5 Jul 2020

Dear Authors,
Add your ethical approval in final file that will be sent for you via email.
"UMCIRB #17-002793: Human participant protection approval provided by the East Carolina University University Institutional Review Board: https://rede.ecu.edu/umcirb
AUP #P098-Animal Use Protocol approval provided by the East Carolina Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee: https://www.ecu.edu/cs-dhs/iacuc/"
Regards,