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.91864
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 8(4); e91864

# Peer Review Report for "Role of Substance Abuse Treatment Centers in Addiction Recurrence"

**Author(s):** Mohammad Khammarnia, Alireza Ansari-Moghaddam, Mostafa Peyvand, Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 15 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 21 Oct 2019

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) — 23 May 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable study
The title has two parts. My opinion is the these two parts are inappropriate. Please the authors clarify and correct it.
- The KEYWORDS not selected from MESH.
- Speak about novelty.
- Clarify participants.
- Please arrange and short tables.
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria are incomplete.
- Explain Ethical Considerations.
- It is no Proper English Grammar and Writing.
- Discussion is poor.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 3 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
I agree with the reviewer and the article needs major revision.

Regard

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0)

3 Jun 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is acceptable after revision.
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.

*Dear Editor,*

*The manuscript is revised and highlighted according to reviewer's comments:*

*The title has two parts. My opinion is these two parts are inappropriate. Please clarify and correct it: the title is revised and clarified.*
*The KEYWORDS not selected form MESH: the keywords changed and they are selected from MESH.*
*Speak about novelty: novelty is added to the end of the introduction.*
*Clarify participants: participants are added and explained in the method.*
*Please arrange and short tables: tables are rearranged and have become shorter.*
*Inclusion and exclusion criteria are incomplete: Inclusion and exclusion criteria are clarified.*
*Explain Ethical Considerations: Ethical Considerations are explained in the method.*
*It is no Proper English Grammar and Writing: English Grammar and Writing is edited by experts.*
*Discussion is poor: discussion is revised.*

**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) 11 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for this valuable study.
The manuscript has revised as reviewers' comments.
But, there are some problems, yet.
- The keywords are as MeSH system, yet.
- The grammatical errors are noticeable, yet.
Regards

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
The author should follow the suggestions of the reviewer. The article is good but needs some corrections.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
Please add the ethical code in the method, add the limitation at the end of the article, revise the grammatical errors, recheck the numbers in the text and tables.
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,

Thank you for your valuable comments. The manuscript is revised according to the reviewer comments as follows:

The keywords are as MeSH system, yet. The keywords is checked by MeSH system.
The grammatical errors are noticeable, yet. The English language of the manuscript is revised.

add the ethical code in method. The ethical code is added.
add the limitation the end of article. The limitation is added.
recheck the numbers in the text and tables. The numbers in the text and tables are rechecked.

Best Regards

**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) 21 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.