

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Can intersectoral interventions reduce substance use in adolescence? Evidence from a multicentre randomized controlled study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Putul Mahanta

Submitted on: 17 May 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604677

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

How have you selected the sample?

What was the prevalence of substance abuse among the population in question?

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

What are the limitations and strengths of your study?

What is the new insight?

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

What is the rationale for this study?

The conclusion is matched with the objective.

The ethical issues need to be addressed in the method section.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, the title is appropriate, concise and attractive.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

KEYWORD LIKE Inter-disciplinary co-ordination may be added, which will be self-explanatory.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Minor grammatical corrections are needed. Use of punctuation should also be noted.

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Newer references should replace decade-old references. Many references are more than ten years old.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11 Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 12 Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.