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.107945
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 10(1); e107945

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Morphine Dependence and Detoxification with Methadone and Buprenorphine on Sexual Behavior and Sex Hormones"

Author(s): Fatemeh Moinaddini, Tahereh Haghpanah, Mohsen Abedini Esfahlani, Maryam Amirinejad, Seyed Noureddin Nematollahi-Mahani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 3 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 11 Jan 2021

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) — 7 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The abstract section should be fully and concisely explained. Explain the total number of mice, statistical methods, calculation of sample members, confidence interval, software used and its version, measurement method, etc. Overall, the article was written and the process was well done.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 11 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Totally the present article is well-established and the subject is interesting, but some major revisions should be considered.
- More suitable title should be selected for the article.
- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results, and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be

able to stand alone.
- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.
- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented in the introduction.
- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives at your debate or argument.
- Please avoid reference overkill/run-on, i.e. do not use more than 3 references per sentence.
- More suitable title should be selected for table 3 instead of “Intromissions type frequencies in the different groups.”.
- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.
- Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to literature review:
Moghaddam et al. A Review on the Addictive Materials Paan Masala (Paan Parag) and Nass (Naswar);
Fenglin, L. Female Objects and Feminist Consciousness for the Purpose to Awake Readers’ Awareness: A Comparative Analysis between Angela Carter’s The Bloody Chamber and Anne Sexton’s Transformations;
Rokach, A. Sexuality, and Internet Use: The Promise and Dangers in Cyberspace.
- Page 6: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:
“Data were recorded in Excel software and transferred to SPSS software (SPSS software version 16 for Windows) for analysis. Following the normality assumption of the data by Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the data were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance (ANOV) followed by Tuckey’s post hoc test. The data were recorded as mean± SEM. A difference of $P<0.05$ among the groups was considered significant.”
- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.
- It is suggested to add articles entitled “Bnirostam & Saberi. Study of Loneliness and Identity Styles among Internet Addicted Students in Faculty of Engineering, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch” to the literature review.
- Conclusion section should be added to the article. Please make sure your conclusions section underscores the scientific value added to your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more detail. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.
- “Notation” should be added to the article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should answer the comments one by one in reply to reviewers' file completely, highlight the changes in min file, reconsider: the limitations, conclusion, ethical considerations and footnotes

regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 20 Sep 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.

Dear editor in chief

International journal of high risk behaviors

To the best of my ability I incorporated the reviewer's comments and made changes to the manuscript according to the reviewer's comments which I hope the revised manuscript would fulfill the journal requirements. The changes made to the manuscript are highlighted in yellow

SN Nematollahi-mahani

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
The abstract section should be fully and concisely explained. Explain the total number of mice, statistical methods, calculation of sample members, confidence interval, software used and its version, measurement method, etc. Overall, the article was written and the process was well done.

Thank you for your comments. I changed the abstract according to the reviewer's comments.

Reviewer 2:
Totally the present article is well-established and the subject is interesting, but some major revision should be considered.

Thank you

- More suitable title should be selected for the article.

I selected a more suitable and precise title for the manuscript as "Effects of morphine dependence and detoxification with methadone and buprenorphine on sexual behavior and sex hormones"

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

I changed the abstract according to the reviewer's comments.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

Thank you for useful comment. A brief explanation of the study structure was presented at the end of introduction.

- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

With thanks please refer to the last paragraph of the introduction.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

With thanks some changes were made to the introduction section.

- Please avoid reference overkill/run-on, i.e. do not use more than 3 references per sentence.

I checked the manuscript for overkill references. There were no sentence with more than 2 references.

- More suitable title should be selected for the table 3 instead of "Intromissions type frequencies in the different groups.".

With thanks, I changed the title of table 3 as follows: Type of intromission in the different groups.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

I searched for similar animal studies in the scientific web-sites such as Pubmed and Google scholar. However, few studies were recruited and are embedded in the text.

- Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to literature review: Moghaddam et al. A Review on the Addictive Materials Paan Masala (Paan Parag) and Nass (Naswar); Fenglin, L. Female Objects and Feminist Consciousness for the Purpose to Awake Readers' Awareness: A Comparative Analysis between Angela Carter's The Bloody Chamber and Anne Sexton's Transformations; Rokach, A. Sexuality and Internet Use: The Promise and Dangers in Cyberspace.

With thanks we used new references in the introduction.

- Page 6: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:
"Data were recorded in Excel software and transferred to SPSS software (SPSS software version 16 for Windows) for analysis. Following normality assumption of the data by Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the data were analyzed by One-way analysis of variance (ANOV) followed by Tuckey's post hoc test. The data were recorded as mean± SEM. A difference of $P<0.05$ among the groups was considered significant."

Corrected with thanks

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.
- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Bnirostam & Saberi. Study of Loneliness and Identity Styles among Internet Addicted Students in Faculty of Engineering, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch" to the literature review.

I added the more important values and also the level of significance to the results. However to avoid over-expression of data, some values are only presented in the figures and tables. I read the abstract of the above-mentioned reference and did not find it in line with our study.

- Conclusion section should be added to the article. Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.
- "Notation" should be added to the article.

I tried to improve the conclusion using the suggested comments with thanks.

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) 24 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
All comments have been addressed properly, so the article suggested publishing with its present form.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Oct 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
It is accepted.
add :
Authors' Contribution:
Conflict of Interests:
Ethical Approval (with ethical code):
Funding/Support:
Informed Consent:
regards,

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.

Dear Editor in chief

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction

I revised the manuscript and embedded the recommended information in the manuscript which are highlighted by yellow.

I wish the revised manuscript would fulfill the journal requirements.

Warm regards,

SN Nematollahi-mahani

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) 28 Dec 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 (3)

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

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction

I revised the manuscript and embedded the recommended information in the manuscript which are highlighted by yellow.

I wish the revised manuscript would fulfill the journal requirements.

Warm regards,

SN Nematollahi-mahani

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 28 Dec 2020

Dear author,
We apologize for the past mistake in your review processing.
Aware that your article is accepted but the number of words is high.
Decrees the words as it is achievable.
regards,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

IJHRB

Thank you for your message. I revised the manuscript and shortened it to 4389 words including references and tables (reduced more than 500 words) . I hope the revised manuscript would meet the journal requirements.

SN Nematollahi-mahani

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (4)** 11 Jan 2021

Dear author,

Please add the limitations in final proof that we will send to you.

accept

regards,