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.95400
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(1); e95400

Peer Review Report for "Cognitive and Metacognitive Impairments of Drug Addicted, Internet Addicted and Normal Individuals in Youth Ages: A Comparative Study"

Author(s): Farideh Hamidi, Jamshid Ghasedi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Jun 2019
Revised Date: 29 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 12 Jan 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)

16 Oct 2019

Dear AE,

- Since cognitive problems and their severity at a young age are different compared to middle age and old age, and since the present study focused only on the youth age group, It seems more appropriate to include youth age in the article title.
- As stated in the introduction of the article, numerous studies have found that substance dependence and Internet addiction can cause cognitive and metacognitive impairments in individuals. Therefore it is unclear what newer goals the current study pursued.
- The cognitive failure questionnaire and metacognitive questionnaire also evaluate items in addition to what is stated in the research objectives, therefore revising the study objectives seems more appropriate.
- The age group of the participants is not specified, It has also not been determined whether the normal group, with the Internet addict group, are studying at the same university? Or they are age-matched.
- Of the 38 references used in the compilation of this article, only 10 have been published after the year 2010. The rest are related to before the year2010, and even they were from 1990. Newer resources need to be used.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the reviewers' request.
Thanks.

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 Editors,
Thank you very much for the referees' statements. I edited and revised my manuscript according to the following questions and highlighted the lines in revised file.

Reviewer 1:
1. Since cognitive problems and their severity at a young age are different compared to middle age and old age, and since the present study focused only on the youth age group, It seems more appropriate to include youth age in the article title.
I did.
2. As stated in the introduction of the article, numerous studies have found that substance dependence and Internet addiction can cause cognitive and metacognitive impairments in individuals. Therefore, it is unclear what newer goals the current study pursed.
Studies showed there is a significant positive correlation between cognitive deficiencies and performance in assignments. Also, in previous studies, results have been showed that using drugs and internet addiction has a significant effect on cognitive regulation emotion and increases the likelihood of cognitive impairments among people. But in this research we have a new comparative study with three groups at one time with different questionair and components in Iran.
3. Cognitive failure questionnaire and metacognitive questionnaire also evaluate items in addition to what is stated in the research objectives, therefore revising the study objectives seems more appropriate.
I did.
4. The age group of the participants is not specified, it has also not been determined whether the normal group, with the Internet addict group, are they studying at the same university? Or they are age-matched.
I added inclusion/exclusion criteria in the section of the method.
5. Of the 38 references used in the compilation of this article, only 10 have been published after year 2010. The rest are related to before the year2010, and even they were from the 1990. Newer resources need to be used.
I added some other new references and revised it.

Reviewer 2:
file is attached.
According to all comments, I revised all of them and highlighted the lines.
Best regards,

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.

Zahra Ghiasi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 14 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
- In the sentence related to reference no.13, the authors repeated emotion.
- Last two criteria are not exclusion criteria. Just no.1 is true.
- They should revise table 2. They shouldn't copy the table from SPSS!
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Dec 2019

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** (1) 29 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
Please add the limitation at end of article, add the contribution of the authors and decrease the number of words.
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 reviewers' comments:
Reviewer 1:
In the sentence related to reference no.13, you repeated emotion.
I deleted the second word.

Last two criteria are not exclusion criteria. Just no.1 is true.
Last two criteria are deleted.

Revise table 2. You shouldn't copy the table from SPSS!
Table 2 is revised.

EIC Decision:
add the limitation at end of article: I did.
add the contribution of authors: I added.
decrease the number of words: I did.

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) 12 Jan 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.