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.106458
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(3); e106458

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of *Toxoplasma gondii* Antibodies in Addicted and Non-Addicted Women in Zahedan, Southeast of Iran"

Author(s): Javid Dehghan Haghighi, Asiyeh Hosseini, Reza Shafiei, Ahmad Mehravaran, Ebrahim Alijani, Hadi Mirahmadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 12 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Aug 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) — 9 Jul 2020

Dear AE,

• The correlation between toxoplasmosis and ethanol consumption has been examined in ethanol consumers in a study in 2017. The results of this study revealed a positive relationship between the presence of the Toxoplasma-IgG antibody and the high consumption of psychoactive substances such as ethanol in consumers (20). However, this study did not point out the possible causes of this correlation. ????? (Ethanol consumption has not been studied)

• It is necessary to discuss the high prevalence of IgM in the present study Because the high prevalence of IgG of Toxoplasma is not an important issue.

• In the discussion, there are some of the sentences from other articles that need to be corrected.

Thanks

Bahador Shahriari: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 18 Jul 2020

Dear AE,

The current study describes the serostatus of Toxoplasma in addicted women in comparison with non-addicted counterparts in Zahedan. The study provided valuable pieces of information and the manuscript can be considered for publication, provided that the authors properly address the raised comments.

Title

As the study compared the seroprevalence of Toxoplasma infection in the addicted and control group, this point should be included in the title. So the appropriate title for this manuscript would be:

Evaluation of Toxoplasma gondii antibodies in addicted in comparison with non-addicted women in Zahedan city in Sistan and Baluchestan province, southeast Iran

Abstract:

Details of the control group should be included in the Abstract section. What type of matching has been done for the control and case groups?

In the Abstract, it is stated that “Also, the seroprevalence of Toxoplasma-IgM was identified 37.5% in addicted women and 27.1% in the control group”. This should be IgG, not IgM.

Materials and methods:

Details of ELISA procedures are not necessary to be included in the materials and methods section, as it has been performed based on the manufacturer’s guidelines.

Toxoplasma gondii or Toxoplasma should come in italic throughout the manuscript.

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Aug 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.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Aug 2020

Dear author,

Answer the comments of reviewers one by one in reply to reviewers file

Highlight the changes in main file

Reconsider the results, limitations, conclusions and footnotes

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,

Answer to reviewers

We appreciate the valuable comments of reviewers

Reviewer 1 (blue dye):

• The correlation of the toxoplasmosis and ethanol consumption has been examined in ethanol consumers in a study in 2017. The results of this study revealed a positive relationship between the presence of the Toxoplasma-IgG antibody and the high consumption of psychoactive substances such as ethanol in consumers (20). However, this study did not point out the possible causes of this correlation. ????? (Ethanol consumption has not been studied)

- We add a sentence about consumption of ethanol in the section of materials and methods

• It is necessary to discuss the high prevalence of IgM in the present study, Because the high prevalence of IgG of Toxoplasma is not an important issue.

- In this study the prevalence of IgM was very low and there is no reason for discus it.

• In the discussion, there are some of the sentences from other articles that need to be corrected.

- We checked overall and corrected.

Reviewer 2 (red dye):

The current study describes the serostatus of Toxoplasma in addicted women in comparison with non-addicted counterparts in Zahedan. The study provided valuable pieces of information and the manuscript can be considered for publication, provided that the authors properly address the raised comments.

Title
As the study compared the seroprevalence of Toxoplasma infection in the addicted and control group, this point should be included in the title. So the appropriate title for this manuscript would be:

Evaluation of Toxoplasma gondii antibodies in addicted in comparison with non-addicted women in Zahedan city in Sistan and Baluchestan province, southeast Iran

- We changed your comments to: Evaluation of Toxoplasma gondii antibodies in addicted in comparison with non-addicted women in Zahedan, southeast of Iran

Abstract:
Details of the control group should be included in the Abstract section. What type of matching has been done for the control and case groups?

- We answered your comment to addicted women with a history of narcotic drug consumption as case group non-addicted women without history of narcotic drug consumption as control group.

In the Abstract, it is stated that "Also, the seroprevalence of Toxoplasma-IgM was identified 37.5% in addicted women and 27.1% in the control group". This should be IgG, not IgM.

- We changed it to IgG

Materials and methods:

Details of ELISA procedures are not necessary to be included in the materials and methods section, as it has been performed based on the manufacture’s guidelines.

- We deleted ELISA procedure and add " it has been performed based on the manufacture’s guidelines"

Toxoplasma gondii or Toxoplasma should come in italic throughout the manuscript.

- All names of Toxoplasma were italic throughout the manuscript.

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) 22 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Bahador Sarkari: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 22 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Aug 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Aug 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.