International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Volume 11 · Issue 3 · e127007

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Effects of Methamphetamine and Narcotics on Sexual High-Risk Behaviors

Farah Lotfi Kashani, Shahram Vaziri, Arash Vaziri

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
11 May 2022	26 Aug 2022	27 Aug 2022	10.5812/ijhrba-127007

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 2, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

2 comments · 23 Jun 2022 – 26 Jun 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 23 Jun 2022

Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript entitled “Effects of Methamphetamine and Narcotics on Sexual High-Risk Behaviors”, which is a valuable study about awkward topics such as substance use and sexual behavior.
Here are some recommendations for you to improve the manuscript.
The background can be more closely related to the issue of high-risk sexual behavior and substance use.
The term abuser results in stigma for patients, and it is recommended that it be replaced with “men suffering from substance use disorder”.
Causal comparative?
There is no evidence of high-risk sexual behavior in the methods and results, although the study aimed to address high-risk sexual behavior!!!
The term “effective” in the results may lead to a misunderstanding about the aim of the study and may have an encouraging effect on the reader.
The results and the conclusion are not in line with the objective of the study.
The introduction is not organized, as some concepts are repeated. For example, the sentences in lines 41 and 45 can be combined into one sentence with 2 references.
Paragraph 4 in the introduction needs to be revised; for example, there is no need for the 74th to 79th lines.
Lines 85 to 92: The aims mentioned in various places in the manuscript differ from each other (in the abstract, objective, background, and the first line of the methods).
What is the meaning of “mental disability”?
The methods are unclear.
The study is not a causal-comparative study; it is only a cross-sectional study.
Methylphenidate abuse has shown a different background compared with amphetamine abuse.
Table 2 can be deleted, and the significant results can be written in the results section of the text.
The subdomain of the questionnaire should be discussed in the discussion section and compared with those in other studies.
In table 2, some high-risk sexual behaviors are statistically significant but were not mentioned in the results, discussion, and conclusion sections.
The conclusion should provide concluding views of the study, not details such as those in table 2. Moreover, provide recommendations for future studies and some applications of the study, or give some advice to practitioners on this issue.
Please add the limitations section.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 26 Jun 2022

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:
major revision: It done

Reviewer 2:
Final decision: Manuscript is acceptable for publication after minor correction as bellow:
Abstract: Acceptable
Thank You
Introduction: Acceptable but could be better by wider literature review particularly related articles from novel researchers.
Thank You
Methodology: Acceptable
Thank You
Results: Acceptable
Thank You
Discussion: Could be scientifically than present level using novel, more and wider literature review and explanation of related survey and of course then using from them as Bibliography/References.
It was done according to the request of the respected referee

Reviewer 3:
Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript entitled: “Effects of Methamphetamine and Narcotics on Sexual High-Risk Behaviors” which is a valuable study about awkward topics such as substance and sexual behavior.
Here is some recommendation for you to make better the manuscript.
The background can be more related to the issue of high-risk sexual behavior and substance.
It done
The term abuser results in stigma for patients and it is recommended to be replaced with “men suffering from substance use disorder”.
It done
Causal comparative?:
Thanks a lot. Was corrected
There is no evidence of high-risk sexual behavior in the method and the result while the study aimed to mention the high-risk sexual behavior!!!
Was corrected
The term of “effective” in the results may have a misunderstanding about the aim of the study and would be an encouraging effect on the reader.
It was corrected
The result and the conclusion are not in line with the objective of the study.
It was corrected
The introduction is not organized where some concepts are repeated such as sentences in lines 41 and 45 can be written in one sentence with 2 references.
Paragraph 4 in the introduction needs to be revised for example there is no need for to 74th to 79th line.
Items were deleted and/or merged.

Line 85 to 92: Mentioned aims in various places of the manuscript are different from each other. (in the abstract, objective, background, and the first line of method)
were assimilated.
What is the meaning of “mental disability”?
It was deleted.
The method is unclear.
The type of study is not a causal-comparative study, it is only a cross-sectional study.
It was corrected

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 3 Aug 2022 – 25 Aug 2022

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 3 Aug 2022

Based on the corrections made to the manuscript in response to the respected reviewers' comments, the article can be published.

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 24 Aug 2022

Thank you for your revision.
Please correct "causal comparative" in the abstract.
According to the abstract, substance use is the best way to improve sexual function, but the objective of the study concerns high-risk sexual behavior, and we don't see anything about this in the abstract or the results section.
Replace "drug abuser" with "drug user" and make the corresponding change to drug abuse.
The results section is not well written; the manuscript provides just 2 tables in the results section without any explanation. There is no information about demographic features, the number of participants, or how many participants use narcotics, methamphetamine, and so on.
There is no need for table 2, which is confusing there.
The discussion section did not provide an appropriate interpretation and needs to be revised. For example, in paragraph 2 of the discussion section, the reason given and the similarity to previous studies are not related to the issue mentioned.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 25 Aug 2022

Minor Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 25 Aug 2022

Minor Revision

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:
According to the corrections made in the manuscript based on the opinions of respected reviewers, the article can be published.
:Thank You

Reviewer 2:
please correct the "causal comparative" in the abstract.
:Thanks, it's done

according to the abstract substance use is the best way to improve sexual function but the objective of the study is about the high-risk sexual behavior and we don't see anything about thin=s in the abstract and the result part.
: The background has been changed

Replace "drug abuser" with "drug user" and also about drug abuse.
:Given that a prescribed drug may be abused, I would like to emphasize abuse, if you may.

the result is not well-written, the manuscript just gives 2 tables in the result part without any explanation. there is no information about demographic features, the number of participants, and how many participants use narcotics, methamphetamine, and ... there is no need to table 2 which is confusing there.
: The table 1 add and table 2 was explained.

discussion part didn't provide advisable interpretation and needs to revise for example in paragraph 2 in the discussion part the reason and similarity with the previous studies are not related to the issue which is mentioned.
: An attempt was made to clarify more.

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.