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

KOWSAR
International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.106741
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: In Press(In Press); e106741

Peer Review Report for "Legalization, Decriminalization or Criminalization; Could We Introduce a Global Prescription for Prostitution?"

Author(s): Hassan Joulaei, Nooshin Zarei, Mohammadali Khorsandian, Amir Keshavarzian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 4 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 11 Apr 2021

Revision (0)

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

Bahar Morshed Behbahani: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 15 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
1. In the methodology are not mentioned the number of articles reviewed and the inclusions or exclusions criteria.
2. The role of culture and communities is mentioned in the discussion section, while this issue is not mentioned in the results. This issue should have been mentioned in the results as well.
3. The discussion compares studies in different countries, while the results of this comparison are not observed.
I suggest that the results be adjusted to reflect the impact of different communities and cultures in different countries.
Thanks.

Seyed Ali Enjoo: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 18 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
It is a well done narrative review article. The paper has a Proper Article TITLE, well-structured accurate, and adequate ABSTRACT, and KEYWORDS.
The paper has an important subject and has been written informatively.
All of the other parts of the paper were significantly well,
I have only one question about the METHODOLOGY and the RESULT: in the result, part authors said: "... three main approaches including criminalization, decriminalization, and legalization are recommended to deal with prostitution", while it was their attitude about the matter when they were searching databases by these three keywords. It could not consider as a type of bias? How do the authors justify that? I think the paper could be better if the authors mention that point.
References are very well but they would improve if some new papers on the matter for years 2020, and 2021 will be added if such papers exist.
Overall, it is a very important, informative, and well-developed paper that deserves to be published. I learned a lot from this paper.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Feb 2021

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) 20 Feb 2021

Dear author,
Highlight the changes in the main file
Answer the comments one by one in reply to reviewers file completely
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.

Authors' response

Manuscript ID 106741

Dear Dr. Nour-Mohammad Bakhshani

Editor-in-chief, International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction

Thank you for reviewing the manuscript and thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled " Legalization, Decriminalization or Criminalization; Could We Introduce a Global Prescription for Prostitution?" We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper and have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. The changes made are highlighted (yellow) in main file and here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 1

Comment 1: In the methodology are not mentioned the number of articles reviewed and the inclusions or exclusions criteria.

Response 1: Thanks to the improving comment, we mentioned the number of included articles and inclusion and exclusion criteria (Given the structure of narrative review studies)

Comment 2: The role of culture and communities is mentioned in the discussion section, while this issue is not mentioned in the results. This issue should have been mentioned in the results as well.

Response 2: Good comment, we mentioned the point at the first paragraph of the results.

Comment 3: The discussion compares studies in different countries, while the results of this comparison are not observed. I suggest that the results be adjusted to reflect the impact of different communities and cultures in different countries

Response 3: In response to this ingenious comments, we added the name of countries that apply each approach in the results in the related part. Discussion about the pros and cons of each approach and the comparison of their context is presented in the discussion part.

Reviewer 2

Comment 1: I have only one question about the METHODOLOGY and the RESULT: in the result part authors said: "... three main approaches including criminalization, decriminalization, and legalization are recommended to deal with prostitution", while it was their attitude about the matter when they were searching databases by these three key words. It could not consider as a type of bias? How the authors justify that? I think the paper could be better if the authors mention that point

Response 1: Many thanks for your methodologic comment. As the very first step in our research process and developing idea & theoretical framework, according to conceptual map and primary literature

review, main concepts and keywords were identified. Legal studies' point of view about similar subjects (as prostitution) is categorized in 3 main approaches (criminalization, decriminalization, and legalization); so it was described in the introduction part, comparison of these approaches introduced as the aim of the study and they were selected as one of the sets of related keywords in our narrative review search strategy. In this regard the results were organized into the three categories to express the strengths and weaknesses of each view retrieved from literature review.

Comment 2: References are very well but they would improve if some new papers on the matter for years 2020, and 2021 will be added if such papers exist.

Response 2: Based on your invaluable suggestion, we added the following references:

- Turek EM, Fairley CK, Bradshaw CS, Chen MY, Vodstrcil LA, Snow A, Fortune R, Chow EPF. Are genital examinations necessary for STI screening for female sex workers? An audit of decriminalized and regulated sex workers in Melbourne, Australia. PLoS One. 2020 Apr 16;15(4):e0231547.
- Sherman SG, Nestadt DF, Silberzahn BE, Decker M, Park JN, Footer KHA. The Role of Sexually Transmitted Infections in Police as Clients Among Street-Based Female Sex Workers in Baltimore City. Sex Transm Dis. 2021 Jan;48(1):12-18.

Also we reviewed and revised the "limitations", "ethical considerations" and "conflict of interest" as your best recommendation.

Sincerely yours,

On behalf of the authors

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.

Seyed Ali Enjoo: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 7 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
I studied the revised version of the paper.
According to my search, there was no Plagiarism or any other scientific misconduct, detectable in the manuscript by my best effort.
The methodology part of the manuscript improved in the revised version than the previous one.
I said before that the Results part as well, and now also is very well.
The referencing and citations are correct, update, and sounds well.
I think the article has Correct and proper English writing. My final decision about this manuscript is ACCEPT, because of the novelty of the topic, and the well-done job. And also because of improvements after the revision.
Thanks.

Bahar Morshed Behbahani: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 7 Apr 2021

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) — 11 Apr 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 11 Apr 2021

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