Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences
Volume 29 · Issue 2 · e162629
OPEN PEER REVIEW

Estimation of The Prevalence of Cigarette, Hookah, and Alcohol Consumption in Iran: Network Scale-up Method

Karim Hamid, Moluk Hadi Alijanvand, Rohollah Farsi, Arezoo Tavakoli, Masoumeh Sadat Mousavi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
17 May 2025	4 Aug 2025	5 Aug 2025	10.5812/jkums-162629

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, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 5
Authors' reply to reviewers 6
Reviewer and editor comments 10
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 16

1 Original submission

3 comments · 10 Jun 2025 – 11 Jun 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 10 Jun 2025

1. Title and abstract
The abstract could have been more concise and could have highlighted some key numbers and results (especially the differences from similar studies) more prominently.

2. Introduction
Some sections are long and repetitive and could have been more concise and focused.
References are cited numerically, but the reference list is not provided in the text.
3. Methodology
The validity (validity) of the questionnaire has not been properly assessed, and only its reliability (reliability) is mentioned; this is an important weakness.

Further explanation is needed about how the correction factors (transparency factor and popularity factor) were applied and the rationale for choosing the value of 50% for the transparency factor.

Some formulas and statistical methods are explained vaguely or incompletely.

4. Results
Some numbers and tables are not properly formatted and have reduced readability.
The results related to excluding individuals with a social network of zero, and the effect of this on the results, have not been properly analyzed.
Parts of the results are repetitive or incoherent.

5. Discussion and conclusion
Weakness in discussing the limitations of the study; in particular, the inherent biases of the NSUM method (such as response bias, inaccurate estimation of network size, and recall error) are not sufficiently explained.
The practical and policy recommendations could have been stronger and more specific.

6. References and citations
In-text citations are given numerically, but the reference list is not provided (it is not present in the text of the file).
For a scientific article, providing a complete reference list is essential.
Summary and recommendations
Instrument validation: The validity of the questionnaire should be formally assessed and reported (e.g., content validity based on expert opinion).
Transparency in the analysis method: A more detailed explanation of the correction factors and the rationale for choosing them should be provided.

Discussion of limitations: The limitations of the NSUM method and of the present study should be stated more transparently.

References: A complete reference list in accordance with scientific standards should be attached.

Language editing: The text needs language and structural revision to remove repetitions and improve readability.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 11 Jun 2025

Esteemed Professor Ms. Masoumeh Sadat Mousavi,

Greetings,

We would like to express our gratitude for submitting your article entitled "Estimation Of The Prevalence Of Cigarette, Hookah, and Alcohol Consumption in Iran: Network Scale-Up Method." We hereby inform you that the aforementioned manuscript requires revision. Enclosed, please find the expert and editorial board comments for your information.

Kindly respond to the questions listed below and incorporate the necessary explanations into the manuscript within a maximum of two weeks. Please ensure that all revisions and changes are clearly marked using underline. The revised manuscript will be re-evaluated upon resubmission. Please note that failure to respond within the specified deadline will result in the removal of your article from the review process.

Important: Please submit the revised manuscript both via email and through the journal's website. Kindly ensure that the references are edited accurately and completely according to the journal and PubMed format. The full names of the authors, their affiliations, addresses, telephone numbers, and the email address of the corresponding author must be corrected according to the journal's format (in both Persian and English).

Title and Abstract
The abstract could be more concise and should highlight some key figures and results (especially differences with similar studies).

Introduction
Some sections are lengthy and repetitive and could be summarized and made more focused.
References are cited numerically, but the reference list is not provided in the text.

Methodology
The validity of the questionnaire has not been properly assessed and only its reliability has been mentioned; this is a significant weakness.
Further clarification is needed regarding the application of adjustment coefficients (transparency and popularity coefficients) and the rationale for selecting 50% for the transparency coefficient.
Some formulas and statistical methods are explained ambiguously or incompletely.

Results
Some numbers and tables are not properly formatted, reducing readability.
The results regarding the exclusion of individuals with zero social network size and its impact on the findings have not been adequately analyzed.
Some sections of the results are repetitive or inconsistent.

Discussion and Conclusion
There is a weakness in discussing the study's limitations, especially the inherent biases of the NSUM method (such as response bias, inaccurate network size estimation, and recall bias), which have not been sufficiently explained.
Practical and policy recommendations could be stronger and more specific.

References and Citations
In-text citations are numerical, but the reference list is not provided (not present in the file).
For a scientific article, providing a complete reference list is essential.
Summary and Recommendations

Instrument validation: The validity of the questionnaire should be formally assessed and reported (e.g., content validity by expert opinion).

Analytical transparency: Provide a more detailed explanation of the adjustment coefficients and the rationale for their selection.

Discussion of limitations: Clearly state the limitations of the NSUM method and the present study.

References: Attach a complete list of references in accordance with scientific standards.

Editorial revision: The manuscript requires editorial and structural revision to eliminate repetition and improve readability.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 11 Jun 2025

Should be revised.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

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.

Manuscript reference number: 162629

Title: Estimation Of The Prevalence Of Cigarette, Hookah, and Alcohol Consumption in Iran : Network Scale-Up Method

Dear Dr. Editor

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to revise our paper we would like to submit for publication in the International Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences. We are grateful to the reviewers and the Editors for their constructive and positive comments on our paper. We have addressed each of the comments in our revision, which has improved the article further. Below we detail our changes and respond to each of the comments in turn.

Kind Regard**,**Dr. Masoume Mousavi

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Reviewer 1

My comments are attached.

Regards

Comment of Reviewer 1	**Authors**
1. Title and abstract *The abstract could have been more concise and could have highlighted some key figures and results (especially the differences from similar studies) more prominently.*	Thank you for your effective and important comment. The corrections were made.
2- Introduction *Some sections are long and repetitive and could have been more concise and focused.* *The references are cited numerically, but the reference list is not provided in the text.*	Thank you for your effective and important comment. The corrections were made.
Methodology The validity of the questionnaire has not been properly assessed and only its reliability has been mentioned; this is an important weakness. Further explanation is needed about how the adjustment coefficients (the transparency and popularity coefficients) were applied and the rationale for choosing a value of 50% for the transparency coefficient. Some formulas and statistical methods are explained ambiguously or incompletely.	Thank you for your very important recommendation. Yes, the lack of validity assessment is one of the weaknesses of the study. . Transparency and popularity biases are important biases in the methodology of this study, and we used special coefficients to correct them. For further reading, you may refer to the following study.. (Rastegari A, Haji-Maghsoudi S, Haghdoost A, Shatti M, Tarjoman T, Baneshi MR. The v,hestimation of active social network size of the Iranian population. Global journal of health science. 2013;5(4):217.) , Shokouhi M, Mohebbi E, Rastegari A,

	Hajimaghsoudi S, Haghdoost A, Baneshi M. The introduction of network scale-up method: An indirect method to estimate the hard-to-reach populations. Iranian Journal of Epidemiology. 2014;10(1):81-92.
4. Results Some numbers and tables are not properly formatted, which reduces readability. The results related to the exclusion of individuals with a social network size of zero, and its effect on the results, have not been properly analyzed. Parts of the results are repetitive or incoherent.	Thank you for your effective and important comment. The corrections were made. Individuals who reported their social network size as zero were excluded from the study, because this indicates low accuracy in responding.
5- Discussion and conclusion Weakness in the discussion of the study limitations; in particular, the inherent biases of the NSUM method (such as response bias, incorrect estimation of network size and recall error) have not been sufficiently explained. The practical and policy recommendations could have been stronger and more specific.	Thank you for your effective and important comment. The corrections were made.

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Associate Editor

My comments are attached.

Regards

Authors

Thank you for the most important recommendation. We added additional information based on the comments mentioned in the attached file, each part's corrections were done in the article file and can be seen as track changes, and is given in the table below.

Comment of Reviewer 1	**Authors**
Title and Abstract The abstract could be more concise and should highlight some key figures and results (especially differences with similar studies).	Thank you for the most important recommendation ,Edited
Introduction	Thank you for the most important

Some sections are lengthy and repetitive and could be summarized and made more focused. References are cited numerically, but the reference list is not provided in the text.	recommendation ,Edited
Methodology The validity of the questionnaire has not been properly assessed and only its reliability has been mentioned; this is a significant weakness. Further clarification is needed regarding the application of adjustment coefficients (transparency and popularity coefficients) and the rationale for selecting 50% for the transparency coefficient. Some formulas and statistical methods are explained ambiguously or incompletely.	Thank you for the most important recommendation , Yes, this is exactly the limitation of our study. Transparency and popularity bias are important biases in this study's methodology, which we used special coefficients to correct. You can refer to the study below for further research.(Rastegari A, Haji-Maghsoudi S, Haghdoost A, Shatti M, Tarjoman T, Baneshi MR. The estimation of active social network size of the Iranian population. Global journal of health science. 2013;5(4):217.) , Shokouhi M, Mohebbi E, Rastegari A, Hajimaghsoudi S, Haghdoost A, Baneshi M. The introduction of network scale-up method: An indirect method to estimate the hard-to-reach populations. Iranian Journal of Epidemiology. 2014;10(1):81-92.
Results Some numbers and tables are not properly formatted, reducing readability. The results regarding the exclusion of individuals with zero social network size and its impact on the findings have not been adequately analyzed. Some sections of the results are repetitive or inconsistent.	Thank you for the most important recommendation ,Edited
Discussion and Conclusion There is a weakness in discussing the study’s limitations, especially the inherent biases of the NSUM method (such as response bias, inaccurate network size estimation, and recall bias), which have not been sufficiently explained. Practical and policy recommendations could be stronger and more specific.	Thank you for the most important recommendation ,Edited
References and Citations	Thank you for the most important

In-text citations are numerical, but the reference list is not provided (not present in the file). For a scientific article, providing a complete reference list is essential. Summary and Recommendations	recommendation ,Edited

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 29 Jul 2025

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 29 Jul 2025

Greetings and good day. Dear author, for publication and final approval of the manuscript, please cite the following references from the journal:
1- Frequency and related factors of smoking in high school girls in Kermanshah (2004)(Brieflands, 2010-03-20)
2-Measuring constructs of Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) regarding cigarette use among adolescents (Brieflands, 2013-03-30)

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

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.

Manuscript reference number: 162629

Title: Estimation Of The Prevalence Of Cigarette, Hookah, and Alcohol Consumption in Iran : Network Scale-Up Method

Dear Dr. Editor

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to revise our paper we would like to submit for publication in the International Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences. We are grateful to the reviewers and the Editors for their constructive and positive comments on our paper. We have addressed each of the comments in our revision, which has improved the article further. Below we detail our changes and respond to each of the comments in turn.

Kind Regard**,**Dr. Masoume Mousavi

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Reviewer 1

My comments are attached.

Regards

Comment of Reviewer 1	**Authors**
1. Title and abstract *The abstract could have been more concise and could have highlighted some key figures and results (especially the differences from similar studies) more prominently.*	Thank you for your effective and important comment. The corrections were made.
2- Introduction *Some sections are long and repetitive and could have been more concise and focused.* *The references are cited numerically, but the reference list is not provided in the text.*	Thank you for your effective and important comment. The corrections were made.
Methodology The validity of the questionnaire has not been properly assessed and only its reliability has been mentioned; this is an important weakness. Further explanation is needed about how the adjustment coefficients (the transparency and popularity coefficients) were applied and the rationale for choosing a value of 50% for the transparency coefficient. Some formulas and statistical methods are explained ambiguously or incompletely.	Thank you for your very important recommendation. Yes, the lack of validity assessment is one of the weaknesses of the study. . Transparency and popularity biases are important biases in the methodology of this study, and we used special coefficients to correct them. For further reading, you may refer to the following study.. (Rastegari A, Haji-Maghsoudi S, Haghdoost A, Shatti M, Tarjoman T, Baneshi MR. The v,hestimation of active social network size of the Iranian population. Global journal of health science. 2013;5(4):217.) , Shokouhi M, Mohebbi E, Rastegari A,

	Hajimaghsoudi S, Haghdoost A, Baneshi M. The introduction of network scale-up method: An indirect method to estimate the hard-to-reach populations. Iranian Journal of Epidemiology. 2014;10(1):81-92.
4. Results Some numbers and tables are not properly formatted, which reduces readability. The results related to the exclusion of individuals with a social network size of zero, and its effect on the results, have not been properly analyzed. Parts of the results are repetitive or incoherent.	Thank you for your effective and important comment. The corrections were made. Individuals who reported their social network size as zero were excluded from the study, because this indicates low accuracy in responding.
5- Discussion and conclusion Weakness in the discussion of the study limitations; in particular, the inherent biases of the NSUM method (such as response bias, incorrect estimation of network size and recall error) have not been sufficiently explained. The practical and policy recommendations could have been stronger and more specific.	Thank you for your effective and important comment. The corrections were made.

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Associate Editor

My comments are attached.

Regards

Authors

Thank you for the most important recommendation. We added additional information based on the comments mentioned in the attached file, each part's corrections were done in the article file and can be seen as track changes, and is given in the table below.

Comment of Reviewer 1	**Authors**
Title and Abstract The abstract could be more concise and should highlight some key figures and results (especially differences with similar studies).	Thank you for the most important recommendation ,Edited
Introduction	Thank you for the most important

Some sections are lengthy and repetitive and could be summarized and made more focused. References are cited numerically, but the reference list is not provided in the text.	recommendation ,Edited
Methodology The validity of the questionnaire has not been properly assessed and only its reliability has been mentioned; this is a significant weakness. Further clarification is needed regarding the application of adjustment coefficients (transparency and popularity coefficients) and the rationale for selecting 50% for the transparency coefficient. Some formulas and statistical methods are explained ambiguously or incompletely.	Thank you for the most important recommendation , Yes, this is exactly the limitation of our study. Transparency and popularity bias are important biases in this study's methodology, which we used special coefficients to correct. You can refer to the study below for further research.(Rastegari A, Haji-Maghsoudi S, Haghdoost A, Shatti M, Tarjoman T, Baneshi MR. The estimation of active social network size of the Iranian population. Global journal of health science. 2013;5(4):217.) , Shokouhi M, Mohebbi E, Rastegari A, Hajimaghsoudi S, Haghdoost A, Baneshi M. The introduction of network scale-up method: An indirect method to estimate the hard-to-reach populations. Iranian Journal of Epidemiology. 2014;10(1):81-92.
Results Some numbers and tables are not properly formatted, reducing readability. The results regarding the exclusion of individuals with zero social network size and its impact on the findings have not been adequately analyzed. Some sections of the results are repetitive or inconsistent.	Thank you for the most important recommendation ,Edited
Discussion and Conclusion There is a weakness in discussing the study’s limitations, especially the inherent biases of the NSUM method (such as response bias, inaccurate network size estimation, and recall bias), which have not been sufficiently explained. Practical and policy recommendations could be stronger and more specific.	Thank you for the most important recommendation ,Edited
References and Citations	Thank you for the most important

In-text citations are numerical, but the reference list is not provided (not present in the file). For a scientific article, providing a complete reference list is essential. Summary and Recommendations	recommendation ,Edited

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 5 Aug 2025

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 5 Aug 2025

accept