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.99574
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(1); e99574

Peer Review Report for "Are Dose and Duration of Methamphetamine Abuse Associated with Psychotic Symptoms?"

Author(s): Seyed Alireza Sadjadi, Amir Rezaei Ardani, Ali Asadi, Mahboubeh Eslamzadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	14 Nov 2019
Revised Date:	10 Feb 2020
Accepted Date:	19 Feb 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)

29 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The following are noteworthy points in the article:
1. Newer references are recommended.
2. Specify the sample size determination formula.
3. Thirteen percent of the sample had a history of psychiatric hospitalization, while the exclusion criteria indicated a history of psychiatric illness.
4. Use of (DSM-V) is recommended for definitions and diagnostic criteria.
5. Substance abuse, also known as drug abuse, is the use of a drug in amounts or by methods that are harmful to the individual or others…(In the absence of dependency criteria) How has the duration of abuse been measured? If "meth - dependence" is meant, the dependency criteria are mentioned. Comparing the duration with amount of use during abuse is not accurate.
6. Methamphetamine-dependent people develop resistance
Therefore, it is necessary to increase the amount. How the two (amount of use and duration) are separated.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Please enter the type of study and the number of samples in the abstracts method.
- Delete the numbers from the discussion and write comparative results.
- List the limitations of the study.
- Review the article in terms of writing principles.
- Statistical results and methods are reviewed by a statistician.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 Dec 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major 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) 9 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
Please pay attention to mention: ethical consideration, limitations and answer the comments of reviewers.
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.

Response to reviewers

Dear editor and reviewers

The authors thank about the valuable comments.

1. Newer references are recommended.
The new references were added (2018, 2019)
2. Specify the sample size determination formula.
Sample size was calculated using pilot sample due to unavailability of similar articles : Lachin (1981) *Controlled Clinical Trials 2: 93-113*

$$n=\frac{\left(z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}+z_{1-\beta}\right)^2}{0.5c^2}+3$$

$$c=\ln\left(\frac{1+r}{1-r}\right)$$

¿ 0.05

$\beta=0.8$

$z_{0.05}=-1.96 \wedge z_{0.2}=0.84$

$r=0.28$

As a result, the sample size was 58.

3. Thirteen percent of the sample had a history of psychiatric hospitalization, while the exclusion criteria indicated a history of psychiatric illness.

Exclusion criteria: history of psychotic disorders before amphetamine abuse not history of psychiatric admission

4. Use of (DSM-V) is recommended for definitions and diagnostic criteria.
We evaluated the patients using DSM-IV.
5. Substance abuse, also known as drug abuse, is use of a drug in amounts or by methods which are harmful to the individual or others…(In the absence of dependency criteria) How has the duration of abuse been measured? If "meth - dependence" is meant, the dependency criteria are mentioned. Comparing the duration with amount of use during abuse is not accurate.

We mean methamphetamine abuse and we assessed methamphetamine abusers

6. Methamphetamine-dependent people develop resistance
Therefore, it is necessary to increase the amount. How the two (amount of use and duration) are separated.
We refer to reference 23 (Su et al. study in China) which evaluate the MAP prevalence among MA abusers in term of duration and dose same as our study.

Reviewer 2:
Enter the type of study and the number of samples in the abstracts method
Type of study added
Delete the numbers from the discussion and write comparative results

We deleted the numbers as possible in this section.

List the limitations of the study

The limitations are listed at the end of discussion

Statistical results and methods are reviewed by a statistician

These sections are reviewed

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)** 19 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is accepted but it needs to add the formulation of sampling in the final pdf.
Specify the sample size determination formula in galley proof.
regards,