International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Volume 11 · Issue 1 · e114519

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Predicting High-risk Behaviors Based on Time Perspective in Iranian Adolescents by Emphasizing the Mediating Role of Decision Making and Inhibitory Response: Path Analysis

Fatemeh Bagherian, Nazir Mozafari, Ali Zadeh Mohammadi, Mahmood Heidari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
13 Mar 2021	23 Oct 2021	30 Oct 2021	10.5812/ijhrba.114519

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Andre Luiz Monezi Andrade, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 13

1 Original submission

2 comments · 9 Apr 2021 – 7 Jun 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 9 Apr 2021

I would like to thank you for your invitation. In the present study, a cross-sectional correlational design was used to evaluate the mediating role of executive function (i.e., risky decision-making and inhibition) in the relationship between time perspective and high-risk behaviors among Iranian adolescents. In my view, the research idea is of great interest, but the study could benefit from more precision. This would enhance the quality of the study and make it more interesting to the scientific community.

GENERAL REVIEW

IJHRBA policy does not allow us to publish papers with numerous grammatical errors. You must ask a native English speaker to edit and proofread your manuscript. Please note that editing is completely different from proofreading. The paper should be written in an academic style. So please make sure there are no English errors.

ABSTRACT

The abstract must include the following separate sections: Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusions. I cannot find any conclusions.

Authors should use the most specific MeSH terms as keywords rather than the broad and more general headings.

BACKGROUND

In general, sentences are very short and sometimes incomprehensible, and the relationship between sentences is not well established in some parts of the article. The introduction is full of extra details and does not highlight the importance of the article. Currently, it is unclear how the study goals relate to the reviewed research in the background and how the study will contribute to further knowledge.

METHODS

It is unclear whether the study is powered to conduct the number of analyses undertaken. Could the authors provide a power analysis or justify why they conducted their analyses without sufficient power?

Could the authors show the Cronbach's alpha for all instruments in their study?

DISCUSSION

The discussion section is very messy and in no particular order. Further, the discussion section does not follow an academic writing style and excludes essential items such as implications and suggestions for future research.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions section does not rise to the level of a conceptual advance. The conclusion should briefly describe the implications of the study, followed by recommendations for future studies.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 7 Jun 2021

Dear author,

Highlight the changes in the main file.

Answer the comments fully, one by one, in the reply to reviewers file.

Comment 1: …

Response 1: …

Reconsider the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations, and footnotes.
Regards,

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

:Reviewer 1

The present study aimed to identify the association between risk .behaviors and executive functions among adolescents
This is a relevant study, but it has methodological limitations that .should be considered
In the introduction, it should be better defined that the authors are studying a part of the executive functions and not the whole process itself as it is written in the text. Also, hypotheses should be inserted at .the end of the introduction
Thank you for valuable comment, it be done in introduction

In the method, the criteria for selecting schools and including participants are not clear. Also, the go-no go task should be better described and what cognitive functions the test measures (specifically .and not broadly as described in the text)
Thank you for valuable comment, added in paper

My biggest concern is that the authors use the term predictor, but this type of analysis is not possible based on the paper's methodology. Even using "SEM" models, the authors need to look at revising this methodology. The discussion is still very superficial and should be more in-depth from different risk behaviors
Thank a lot, the paper's methodology revised. the aim of present paper investigate relation between components of time perspective and risky behaviors by emphasize on mediator role of decision making and inhibitory response. For more see DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-020-00633-4

Reviewer 2:

I would like to thank you for your invitation. In the present study, a cross-sectional correlational design was used to evaluate the mediating role of executive function (i.e., risky decision-making and inhibition) in the relationship between time perspective and high-risk behaviors among Iranian adolescents. In my view the research idea is of great interest but the study could benefit from more precision. This would enhance the quality of the study and interest to the scientific community.
GENERAL REVIEW IJHRBA policy does not allow us to publish papers with numerous grammatical errors. You must ask a native English speaker to edit and proofread your manuscript. Please note that editing is completely different from proofreading. The paper should be drafted academically. So please make sure there are no English errors.
The introduction and the whole text revised and corrected in terms of grammar and writing.

ABSTRACT
The abstract must include the following separate sections: Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusions. I cannot find any conclusions.
Thanks a lot, conclusions added in abstract.

Authors should use the most specific MeSH terms as keywords rather than the broad and more general headings.
Keywords changed.

BACKGROUND
In general, sentences are very short and sometimes incomprehensible, and the relationship between sentences is not well established in some parts of the article. The introduction is full of extra details and does not highlight the importance of the article. Currently it is unclear how the study goals relate to the reviewed research in the background and how the study will contribute to further knowledge.
Thanks, the whole text has been revised and edited.

METHODS
It is unclear whether the study is powered to conduct the number of analyses undertaken. Could the authors provide a power analysis or justify why they conducted their analyses without sufficient power? Could the authors show the Cronbach's alpha for all instruments in their study?
About neurocognitive tools, because they are not culture dependent, so they usually do not need validity and validity. But Cronbach's alpha of the questionnaires was added.

DISCUSSION
The discussion section is very messy and in no particular order. Further, the discussion section does not follow the academic writing style and exclude essential items such as Implications and suggestions for future research.
Thanks for your valuable comment, the discussion was generally reviewed and added Implications and suggestions for future research.

Editor's Comments:
Reconsider the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations and footnotes
Thanks, the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations and footnotes were revised.
And previous journal articles were used as References.

Regards.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 9 Sep 2021 – 4 Oct 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT 9 Sep 2021

I would like to thank you for taking all my comments into consideration.

Andre Luiz Monezi Andrade Reviewer — ACCEPT 11 Sep 2021

The authors responded to all the reviewers' requests.

Associate Editor — MINOR REVISION 4 Oct 2021

Dear EIC,
The changes are acceptable, but the article is bulky.
regards,

Editor-in-Chief — MINOR REVISION 4 Oct 2021

Dear author,
Reduce the word count without affecting the strength and important content of your manuscript.
Reduce the number of words as much as possible.
regards,

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

:Reviewer 1

The present study aimed to identify the association between risk .behaviors and executive functions among adolescents
This is a relevant study, but it has methodological limitations that .should be considered
In the introduction, it should be better defined that the authors are studying a part of the executive functions and not the whole process itself as it is written in the text. Also, hypotheses should be inserted at .the end of the introduction
Thank you for valuable comment, it be done in introduction

In the method, the criteria for selecting schools and including participants are not clear. Also, the go-no go task should be better described and what cognitive functions the test measures (specifically .and not broadly as described in the text)
Thank you for valuable comment, added in paper

My biggest concern is that the authors use the term predictor, but this type of analysis is not possible based on the paper's methodology. Even using "SEM" models, the authors need to look at revising this methodology. The discussion is still very superficial and should be more in-depth from different risk behaviors
Thank a lot, the paper's methodology revised. the aim of present paper investigate relation between components of time perspective and risky behaviors by emphasize on mediator role of decision making and inhibitory response. For more see DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-020-00633-4

Reviewer 2:

I would like to thank you for your invitation. In the present study, a cross-sectional correlational design was used to evaluate the mediating role of executive function (i.e., risky decision-making and inhibition) in the relationship between time perspective and high-risk behaviors among Iranian adolescents. In my view the research idea is of great interest but the study could benefit from more precision. This would enhance the quality of the study and interest to the scientific community.
GENERAL REVIEW IJHRBA policy does not allow us to publish papers with numerous grammatical errors. You must ask a native English speaker to edit and proofread your manuscript. Please note that editing is completely different from proofreading. The paper should be drafted academically. So please make sure there are no English errors.
The introduction and the whole text revised and corrected in terms of grammar and writing.

ABSTRACT
The abstract must include the following separate sections: Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusions. I cannot find any conclusions.
Thanks a lot, conclusions added in abstract.

Authors should use the most specific MeSH terms as keywords rather than the broad and more general headings.
Keywords changed.

BACKGROUND
In general, sentences are very short and sometimes incomprehensible, and the relationship between sentences is not well established in some parts of the article. The introduction is full of extra details and does not highlight the importance of the article. Currently it is unclear how the study goals relate to the reviewed research in the background and how the study will contribute to further knowledge.
Thanks, the whole text has been revised and edited.

METHODS
It is unclear whether the study is powered to conduct the number of analyses undertaken. Could the authors provide a power analysis or justify why they conducted their analyses without sufficient power? Could the authors show the Cronbach's alpha for all instruments in their study?
About neurocognitive tools, because they are not culture dependent, so they usually do not need validity and validity. But Cronbach's alpha of the questionnaires was added.

DISCUSSION
The discussion section is very messy and in no particular order. Further, the discussion section does not follow the academic writing style and exclude essential items such as Implications and suggestions for future research.
Thanks for your valuable comment, the discussion was generally reviewed and added Implications and suggestions for future research.

Editor's Comments:
Reconsider the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations and footnotes
Thanks, the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations and footnotes were revised.
And previous journal articles were used as References.

Regards.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 30 Oct 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 30 Oct 2021

accept