

Review of: "Measuring the harms of psychotropic substance use and poly-use in the nightlife scene: a pilot application of poly-drug use indicators on Italian data collected within the ALAMA study"

Nuwan Darshana¹

¹ University of Ruhuna

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. Interesting topic and authors try to explain the topic of interest in detail. However, it was not focused on the topic of interest. Authors can modify the paper to improve comprehensiveness of the manuscript by uplifting the scientific writing.

Abstract: Abstract does not focus the study. It does not follow scientific writing. It just contains few important points related to the topic of interest, but not to the study. It would be better, if it can provide a structured abstract including summary of methodology, results and conclusion.

Introduction: Authors try to provide an extensive description on topic of interest. But it is not focused on topic of interest and too long. Some content in the introduction even not related to the present study. Authors failed to provide evidences for important points in the introduction using appropriate references.

Methodology. Methodology doesn't give a clear picture on what authors have done. It should be modified by stating study population, study settings, study sample, data collection instrument and method of data collection/ data extraction to give clear idea the way of conduction the study.

Results. Authors highlighted informative results of the study. However, results section also doesn't focus on the study objective. Use of too much graphs and figures failed to give clear information of the study results. Providing too much information which does not support to the study objective had masked the important findings of the study. It seems authors had discussed results then and there, but it is hard to differentiate. Result section should be modified focusing on study objectives.

Discussion; No separate discussion. But had discussed important points within results as well as after results by putting subheadings in ad hoc manner. It would be better if authors can discuss results in logical sequence by providing evidence from literature with appropriate references.

Conclusion. Authors had conclude the study findings but again it is not much focused. Incorporation of references in to conclusion is not appropriate. Authors failed to provide recommendations based on key points of the study results.

Overall comment : Authors had done a extreme good work in very important topic but quality of the work had been reduced due to inappropriate writing style. It can be easily modified into excellent paper by following principles of scientific writing.