International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Volume 12 · Issue 2 · e134015

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Survey of Prevalence and Content of Hallucinations and Delusions in Methamphetamine Dependents

Ali Nazari, Seyed Kaveh Hojjat, Asieh Jafakesh Moghadam, Mina Norozi Khalili, Hadi Akbari, Mohammad Khorrami, Javad Sherafati, Mostafa Akbarzadeh, Zahra Barati Farimani, Faezeh Kaviyani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
5 Dec 2022	30 Apr 2023	4 May 2023	10.5812/ijhrba-134015

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 Revision 2 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

1 comment · 5 Jan 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 5 Jan 2023

I would like to thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. I read the article carefully. Although the current article is scientifically valuable, the presence of some major issues prevents it from being published at this stage of the review process.

I believe that the current study is an analytical cross-sectional study.

Please replace "the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)" with "the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5)".

In the introduction section, the authors should address possible factors related to stimulant-induced psychosis and shortcomings in this field.

"Abuse" and "dependency" have been replaced by "substance use disorder" in DSM-5. My suggestion is that the authors consider the necessary corrections in all parts of the article.

The discussion section is very messy and lacks essential items such as practical implications, limitations, and future directions.

Finally, I strongly recommend that the paper be checked by a native English speaker or professional English editing service before re-submission.

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.

Dear Editor-in-Chief

International *journal* of high risk *behaviors* & addiction

Subject: Revision and resubmission of manuscript

Thank you for your letter and the opportunity to revise our paper on "**The survey of prevalence and content of hallucinations and delusions in methamphetamine dependents** ". The suggestions offered by the reviewers have been immensely helpful. We have included the reviewer comments immediately after this letter. We have included the reviewer comments immediately after this letter. The changes are marked in the manuscript as you requested.

We hope the revised manuscript will better suit *the Journal of International journal* of high risk *behaviors* & *addiction* but are happy to consider further revisions, and we thank you for your continued interest in our research.

Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Response to Reviewer 1:

Comment 1(Abstracte): *The aim of this study was to survey of prevalence and content of hallucinations and delusions in methamphetamine dependence.*

Response: *At the* reviewer's suggestion, *we* have *corrected this.*

Comment 2(Line 36): *Write comparative statistics. What is the first drug?*

Response: (In Iran, methamphetamine is the most widely used illegal substance after narcotics.)

Comment 3(Line 65): It is not appropriate to use the word "we" in writing articles.
Response: *At the* reviewer's suggestion, *we* have *corrected this.*

Comment 4(Line 69): First, write the type of study

Response: *At the* reviewer's suggestion, *we* have *added this.* The analytical cross-sectional study was carried out between September 2018 and May 2019

Comment 5(Line 73): in what year?

Response: *At the* reviewer's suggestion, *we* have *added this.* The analytical cross-sectional study was carried out between September 2018 and May 2019

Comment 6(Line 81): Mention the criteria for inclusion and exclusion the study

Response: *At the* reviewer's suggestion, *we* have Mentioned *this.* . Inclusion criteria were a positive methamphetamine test result, the absence of severe cognitive impairment to prevent the participants from correctly answering the questions, and the willingness to participate in the study. The individuals participated voluntarily and all signed the informed consent from. They were assured about the confidentiality of their information including the names, and there were no costs for tests, psychiatric examination, and counseling. Individuals with severe mental disorders or those who were unable to complete the questionnaire/ interview process were excluded from the study.

Comment 7(Line 85): add reference

Response: *At the* reviewer's suggestion, *we* have *added this.* American Psychiatric Association D, Association AP. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5: American psychiatric association Washington, DC; 2013.

Comment 8(Line 93): Code of ethics should be mentioned in research and ethical considerations.
Response: *At the* reviewer's suggestion, *we* have *added this.* IR.NKUMS.REC.1397.029.

Comment 9(Line 153): *Avoid bringing and repeating the results by mentioning numbers in the* discussion.

Response: *We* have *corrected the dictation base of this suggestion*

Comment 10(Line 153): The conclusion is too long to summarize.

Response: *We* have *corrected the Conclusion base of this suggestion.*

Comment 11(Line 237): *Avoid bringing and repeating the results by mentioning numbers in the* discussion.

Response: *We* have *corrected the dictation base of this suggestion, in manuscript.*

Comment 12(Line 293): Some references are old.

Response *We* have *changed all references that reviewer was suggested.*

Response *to Reviewer 2:*

Comment 1: *I believe that the current study is an analytical cross-sectional study.*
Response: At the *reviewer's suggestion,* we *have* corrected this.

Comment 2: *Please replace "the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)" with "the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5)".*
Response: At the *reviewer's suggestion,* we *have* corrected this.

Comment 3: *In the introduction section, the authors should address possible factors related to stimulants-induced psychosis and shortcomings in this field.*
Response: At the *reviewer's suggestion,* we *have addressed possible factors related to stimulants-induced psychosis in the and added that in manuscript.*

.

Comment 4:*"Abuse" and "dependency" have been replaced by "substance use disorder" in DSM5. My suggestion is that the authors consider the necessary corrections in all parts of the article.*
Response: *At the* reviewer's suggestion, *we* have *corrected them during manuscript.*

Comment 5: *The discussion section is very messy and lacks essential items such as practical implications, limitations, and future directions.*
Response: We have revised the discussion section and tried to present a coherent and ordinary text with necessary changes.

Comment 6: *Finally, I strongly recommend that the paper be checked by a native English speaker or professional English editing service before re-submission.*
Response: At the *reviewer's suggestion*, we *have revised manuscript* and corrected this.

---

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

Dear Editor-in-Chief

International *journal* of high risk *behaviors* & addiction

Subject: Revision and resubmission of manuscript

Thank you for your letter and the opportunity to revise our paper on "**The survey of prevalence and content of hallucinations and delusions in methamphetamine dependents** ". The suggestions offered by the reviewers have been immensely helpful. We have included the reviewer comments immediately after this letter. We have included the reviewer comments immediately after this letter. The changes are marked in the manuscript as you requested.

We hope the revised manuscript will better suit *the Journal of International journal* of high risk *behaviors* & *addiction* but are happy to consider further revisions, and we thank you for your continued interest in our research.

Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Response to Reviewer:

Comment 1: *The discussion section is very messy and rewrite this part. in the end of discussion, write limitations of the study and mention suggestions for future studies.*

Response: *We have revised the discussion section and tried to present a coherent and ordinary text with necessary changes.*

Comment 2: - *Some references are too old, change references no 13 ,14,21 to new references.*

Response: *We* have *changed all references that reviewer was suggested*.

Comment 3: - *There are some grammatical mistakes in the manuscript, the paper should be checked by a professional English editing service.*

Response: At the *reviewer's suggestion, our manuscript checked by a professional English editing service.*

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.