



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_47101
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Executive Function of Brain between Drug-dependent , in Abstinences and normal individuals in Tehran
Type of the Article	Original research paper

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Interesting theme! Some comments were made in order to contribute to the authors:</p> <p>1 - The Abstract (Summary) <u>doesn't</u> clearly and accurately describe the content of the article. There is no information regarding the type of study. (Check the Journal abstract example): <a href="http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/48/authors-instruction">http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/48/authors-instruction</a></p> <p>2 – Keywords: Immediately after the abstract, about <b>4-8</b> keywords should be given. In the manuscript there is only three keywords.</p> <p>3 – Introduction: Write more about the different types of drugs: ecstasy, solvents, marijuana, alcohol, LSD, crack, among others. The problem (introduction) is significant and concisely stated. However, I suggest the use of more references, some cited by the author are relevant, but there are more recent references (with other populations), which he could use to add a greater impact to his study.</p> <p>4 - The methods aren't described comprehensively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There isn't information regarding the type of study (epidemiological, observational, cross-sectional, cohort ...)</li> <li>- First paragraph of Methods, better specify the type of service (example: private, public, ...) offered to society.</li> <li>- Specify best how the transcription of the report is performed and how the result is released.</li> <li>- What level of significance was adopted in this study to reject the null hypothesis?</li> <li>- What parameters were used in the comparative analysis?</li> <li>- What are the Risks and Limitations for the Study?</li> </ul> <p>5 - Throughout the text, results, write percentages between parentheses and absolute numbers out of parentheses. Give <b>emphasis</b> to <b>statistical significance study results</b>.</p> <p>6 - There are few interpretations and conclusions justified by the results. Discuss the results found with other references. The first paragraph of the Discussion should include <b>the most relevant</b> findings of the study.</p> <p>7 - Conclusions: A clear and unique conclusion of the authors is needed. In addition, In both Discussion and Conclusion, the authors need to clarify their positions.</p> <p>8 – The references aren't in the norms of the Journal. Rewrite! Check the examples: <a href="http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/48/authors-instruction">http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/48/authors-instruction</a></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Very interesting article for drug dependence but confusing methods and results little discussed.</p> <p>Studies about drug dependence are important and can contribute to the best</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	knowledge in this public health problem.. The manuscript contains new and significant information to justify publication.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Interesting study and theme. However, it is necessary to clarify the results and to improve the discussion and to make a brief conclusion.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>There is no such information. However, as there are human subjects involved, there should be informed consent, protection of privacy, and other human rights against further criteria against which the manuscript will be judged. It should provide a statement to confirm that the authors have obtained all necessary ethical approval from the Institutional or State or National or International Committee. This confirms either that this study is not against the public interest, or that the release of information is allowed by legislation.</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Diego Zapelini do Nascimento</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of Southern Santa Catarina, Brazil.</i></b>