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.91968
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(4); e91968

Peer Review Report for "Psychometric Properties of Young's Internet Addiction Test in Nigeria"

Author(s): Bede Chinonye Akpunne, Ebenezer Olutope Akinnawo, Oluseyi Abiodun Alakija, Daniel Oluwasanmi Kumuyi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 May 2020
Revised Date: 29 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 31 Oct 2020

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) — 13 Aug 2020

Dear AE
I reviewed the manuscript entitled " Psychometric Properties of Young's Internet Addiction Test in Nigeria ", I would like to thank the author for doing an applied research in Nigeria.
There are some questions :
- For determining the cut off points, usually, we need a gold standard , I did not find the gold standard test . How did the authors calculate the cut off point of the test?
- What are the limitation of the study?
Also the Discussion section must be more developed specifically to consider psycho-social factors in Nigeria and important theories on assessment of addiction.
Regards.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 5 Sep 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

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

5 Sep 2020

Dear Author,

Please answer the comments in reply to the reviewers file completely, highlight the changes in the main file, reconsider:

results, limitations, conclusions, and ethical considerations.

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.

REPLY TO REVIEWERS

The following corrections have been made as suggested by the reviewers

1. The gold standard test used in calculating the cut off point has been properly explained
2. The limitations of the study has been supplied
3. We have also improved on the discussion of the finding using two theories of addiction and relating these to the psychosocial factors of Nigeria.
4. All the reviews are highlighted in yellow

Thank you

Akpunne Bede

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 13 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
Please add an ethical code in the Ethical Considerations part.
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.

REPLY TO REVIEWER

Ethical code has been added as requested.

Thank You

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) 26 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
Ethics code not found.
regards,

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.

REPLY TO REVIEWERS

The following corrections have been made as suggested by the reviewers

1. Explanation on Ethical code has been supplied

Thank you

Akpunne Bede

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) 31 Oct 2020

Dear Author,

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

Thanks.