

Peer Review

Review of: "Will You Tell? Factors Influencing Peer Reporting of Illicit Substance Use: A Mixed-Methods Study"

Ellen Almirol¹

1. Infectious Disease, Medicine Department, University of Chicago, United States

1. For the Abstract, the text states "opted out" in the first sentence. I would include "opted out to report peers' use of illicit substances" to reiterate the primary outcome of the study.

2. More out of curiosity, the number of total respondents was 57 out of what I believe is 70 or so students. By chance, would the co-authors have the demographics of the non-respondents? If so, I would recommend conducting a sensitivity analysis on the 13-15 or so students who did not report to see if indeed it was more male students who did not opt in to the survey. If, in case, they did, the % of reporting to peers may be higher or lower than what is currently presented (56%). This type of sensitivity analysis will be insightful, though not necessary for publication.

For the quantitative results:

3. For Table 1, please put a space between n (%). So, it would look like this: N (%).

4. For Table 2, I would suggest reporting the p-values to the same decimal point. Based on what I see, the 100th decimal point would be ideal. Right now, it varies from the 10th to the 1000th. Also, it looks like "Family history of use" was significant as 0.04 and would need an asterisk.

5. What is the difference between "Personal History of Use of Substances" and "Family History of Use"? Are those definitions listed in the Methods?

6. For under Results and 3. Predictors of Reporting Illicit Substance Use, it looks like "reporting history of substance use" is stated twice but with different 95% CIs. I would try and re-word to differentiate the two if they were meant to be separate. Otherwise, please report one to reduce confusion.

7. There is a period missing between "and "Table". Text is shown as: "The intercept is also significant (B = -1.170, p < 0.001). p = 0.00" [.] Table is as shown in Table 3.

8. Table 4. I would just add the space between n and %.

For the qualitative results:

9. Very organized and thought-out flow. My only suggestion, though only a preference, would be to start with the section "5. Reasons for Not Reporting: (Why I will not Tell?)" since that is the primary finding in the quant results. Then, the other

sections of why you would tell (#4) and can you still be a friend to that person (#6) follow, as they seem more of a secondary outcome.

10. In general, when reporting qualitative findings, I would list out themes but not necessarily n (%). Though I will defer to the journal's guidelines for when reporting qualitative findings in a table.

11. The discussion, though substantive, seems to be a little disjointed in how the results were presented to the organization of the Discussion. I do not necessarily suggest going from qual to quant results but would have the co-authors think about inter-mixing the results of both qual and quant by subject matter (e.g., grouping quantitative results about opting out to reporting peers, and then supporting the quant results with qualitative findings). Right now, the Discussion reflects more on the qualitative findings and then switches to quant. I would recommend massaging the quant and qual results more together.

12. In the Discussion, I would include quotes around "criminals" and "sinners" to reflect that these are direct quotes from the participants/students. However, when reviewing the text in the Results, there was no wording from "sinners" reported. If so, I would include that in the Results section before using that in the Discussion.

13. In the Discussion, it states a "higher percentage preferred to report [...] the mother". How was this quantified? If this was not part of the quantitative findings, and more qualitative, then I would suggest stating "Majority of participants reported..." to remove any quantification measures.

Overall, great paper and supportive findings within this specific community.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.