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.106918
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(4); e106918

Peer Review Report for "Current Situation of Nutrition Services in Selected Drug Treatment and Rehabilitation Centers in the Philippines"

Author(s): Imelda Angeles-Agdeppa, Frances Pola Santos Arias, Ren Annaliz Pabustan Garingo, James Andrei Justin Pascual Sy

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 23 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Oct 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)

14 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript entitled “Current Situation of Nutrition Services in Selected Drug Treatment and Rehabilitation Centers in the Philippines“ ID 106918.
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Page1:
- Keywords should be corrected based on the MESH format:
for example, Persons Who Use Drugs.
- Introduction is very long.
Page 4:
Sampling: The study was conducted in 2016, it is possible that changes have been made in the nutrition services since 4 years ago, it is suggested that the data be updated.
Page 13:
- There is no Acknowledgments in the manuscript. It is suggested after the conclusion is written.
- The manuscript has minor grammatical errors and would be improved.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript carefully. Would you please find the following comments?
- Abstract, in the aim section, the place of the study should be mentioned preferably.
- In the abstract of the methodology section, it is suggested express the number of samples
- In the abstract of the methodology section, anthropocentric indicators and nutritional assessment should be clearly stated.
- In the methodology, what is the sample size and sampling? Please, explain by age group and gender.
- What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the population study?
- In the methodology section of data collection, what is mentioned in the questionnaire? How many parts did the questionnaire have? Are the questions open or closed? Please more explain.
- Did the questionnaire self-made or was taken from somewhere?
- In the statistical analysis section, please mention the relevant software and version of it.
- Given that the study was descriptive, it is suggested to do a statistical analysis of the differences between the studied variables in the governmental and private TRCs, which more clearly presented the results? Meanwhile, it is recommended to refer P-value.
- Preferably, according to anthropometric indicators, it is suggested that the body mass index (BMI) has been used in both sexes of population study. Because the above index is widely used and valid in nutritional assessments.
- Obviously, using the above index, we can better judge the evaluation of anthropocentric indicators.
- Given that the amount of energy received is mentioned in the discussion section of the manuscript, it seems that a quantitative nutritional assessment (recall method) is needed in this study. There is a gap based on the aim of the study.
- International standards (RDA, DRI,…)are usually used to compare daily energy intake and other nutrients in the population studies. Because in this way, the nutritional status can be better analyzed in descriptive studies.
Thanks.

Farzad Shidfar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 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) 22 Aug 2020

Dear author,
Please answer the comments one by one in reply to reviewers file in detail.
highlight the changes in main file. recheck the limitations, conclusion and ethical considerations.
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.

COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Associate Editor's Comments: *Associate Editor 1:* *The response of reviewers are received and this article needs major revision .The authors must revised paper according to reviewers comments.* *1-In the affiliation "food and Nutrition research Institute" is dependent to university or it is independent.it means that is this affiliation completely written?*	Food and Nutrition Research Institute is a government research agency under the Department of Science and Technology which is the lead agency in food and nutrition research and development in the Philippines
2- what is the limitation of study?	The results of the study were not able to compare the difference between the government and private TRCs. Also, since this is a cross-sectional study which started in 2017, the data presented in this study is the status of the TRC at time of survey.
Reviewer 1	
Page1: *- Key words should be corrected based on the MESH format:* *for example: Persons Who Use Drugs .* *- Introduction is very long.*	-keywords selected were revised according to MeSH format (p. 2) -Introduction was shortened (p. 3)
Page 4: *Sampling: The study was conducted in 2016, it is possible that changes have been made in the nutrition services since 4 years ago, it is suggested that the data be updated.*	-The survey started last July 2017 and completed June 2018. The researchers assume no major changes since the recommendations for change were just endorsed to the responsible agency this year. The census of the Drug TRCs in the Philippines was based on the 2016 data.
Page 13: *There is no Acknowledgments in manuscript. It is suggested , after conclusion is written.* *The manuscript has minor grammatical errors and would be improved.*	-Acknowledgement was already added after the Conclusion (p.15) Grammar has been checked
Reviewer 2	
Abstract, in the aim section, the place of the study should be mentioned preferably.	-location of the study was indicated *(from Regions 1, III, IV-A, VI, XI and the National Capital Region of the Philippines)* (p. 1)
In the abstract of the methodology section, it is suggested express the number of samples	-the sample is the 19 selected TRCs (p.1)

In the abstract of the methodology section, anthropometric indicators and nutritional assessment should be clearly stated.	-indicators were already specified (p.1) *The anthropometric measurements regularly performed by the TRCs in the study are weight and height while the dietary assessment done was only recording of plate waste.*
In the methodolodgy, what is the sample size and sampling? Please, explain by age group and gender.	-The samples are the 19 TRCs *(from Regions 1, III, IV-A, VI, XI and the National Capital Region)* and random sampling was performed (p.1 and p. 5)
What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the population study?	-TRCs included in the study were those with residential services with the management's signed consent agreeing to partake in the research. On the other hand, TRCs who are excluded from the study are those who only have out-patient services and with management that were reluctant to be interviewed. (p.5)
In the methodology section of data collection, what are mentioned in the questionnaire? How many parts did the questionnaire have? Are the questions open or closed? Please more explain.	-The questionnaire has three parts which have a combination of close and open-ended questions: 1) General information about the Operations of the TRC; 2) The existing Rehabilitation Program and services in the area; and 3) The Dietary Management implemented. (p. 5) -General information on the operations: consist questions on total bed capacity, hospital staff available -Rehabilitation Program: question on the treatment modalities, activities, intervention period -Dietary Management: type of diet provided to the patients, budget for patient meals, type of food service, duration of cycle menu if there's any, dietary facility other nutrition services provided;
Did the questionnaire self-made or was taken from somewhere?	- the questionnairre was developed by FNRI for the purpose of this descriptive study
In the statistical analysis section, please mention the relevant software and version of it. *Given that the study was descriptive, it is suggested to do statistical analysis of the differences between the studied variables in the governmental and private TRCs, which more clearly presented the results? Meanwhile, it is recommended to refer P value.* *Preferably, according to anthropometric*	-All descriptive analysis was performed using STATA version 13. (p.6)

indicators, it is suggested that the body mass index (BMI) has been used in the both sex of population study. Because the above index is widely used and validity in nutritional assessments.	
Obviously, using the above index, we can better judge about the evaluation of anthropocentric indicators. *Given that the amount of energy received is mentioned in the discussion section of the manuscript, it seems that a quantitative nutritional assessment (recall method) is needed in this study. There is a gap based on aim of study.* *International standards (RDA,DRI,…)are usually used to compare daily energy intake and other nutrients in the population studies. Because in this way, the nutritional status can be better analyzed in descriptive studies.*	The study is focused on conducting profiling of the TRCs to determine if they implement nutrition services as part of their rehabilitation program. Obtaining the dietary and anthropometric data of the patients were not part of the study objectives

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) 14 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript carefully. In my opinion, the respected author (s) have not been answered to the following comments yet;
- In the abstract of the methodology section, it is suggested to express the number of samples not revised.
- In the methodology, what is the sample size and sampling? Please, explain by age group and gender. Totally, How many persons participate in this study (based on government-owned and private treatment & rehabilitation centers)?
- In general, nutritional assessment was performed qualitatively, not quantitatively. But the evaluation method is unknown. What is its protocol?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 15 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
I read the manuscript carefully. In my opinion, the respected author (s) have not been answered to the following comments yet;
- In the abstract of the methodology section, it is suggested to express the number of samples Not revised.
- In the methodology, what is the sample size and sampling? Please, explain by age group and gender. Totally, How many persons participate in this study (based on government-owned and private treatment & rehabilitation centers)?
- In general, nutritional assessment was performed qualitatively, not quantitatively. But the evaluation method is unknown. What is its protocol?
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Sep 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 (2)

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.

Reviewer 1:
Dear Associate editor-In-chief
I read the manuscript carefully. In my opinion, the respected author (s) have not been answered to the following comments yet;

COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Reviewer 1	
In the abstract of the methodology section, it is suggested express the number of samples Not revised.	Number of respondents is 45. It is already included in the Abstract (p. 1) and Methods (p.5) section
In the methodology, what is the sample size and sampling?	The sample size is 19 Treatment rehabilitation Centers with 45 respondents involving directors, program managers, nutritionist-dietitian, psychometrician, head nurse, doctor, social worker, head cook, and administrative officers. The 19 TRC were randomly selected government and private TRC obtained from the list of accredited TRCs in the Philippines provided by the Department of Health.
Please, explain by age group and gender. *How many persons participate in this study (based on government-owned and private treatment & rehabilitation centers)?*	Profile of the respondents (mean age and sex) is presented in Table 1 (p. 17) A total of 45 respondents participated in the key informant interview, 24 from the government and 21 from the private TRCs (p.5)
In general, nutritional assessment was performed qualitatively, not quantitatively. *But the evaluation method is unknown. What is its protocol?*	The nutritional assessment in this study pertains to determining the actual conduct of this assessment among PWUDs whether this service is done as part of the management of in the center (p. 6)

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 14 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
Please add the limitations in the final proof.
regards,