

Review of: "The HERMESS model for addictive behaviors recovery"

Jessica McDaniel¹

¹ Kennesaw State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The present manuscript is of conceptual interest to the behavioral health field, however, it includes substantial flaws that obscure its utility. Generally speaking, the abstract provides weak insight into the point of the manuscript. Furthermore, the manuscript itself seems unfinished as there are incomplete sentences and poor transitions. The sentence/paragraph about contagion, connection, and homophily is disconnected from any other part of the manuscript.

The manuscript provides a shallow and inadequate overview of recovery capital, which is not tied to other sections of the manuscript. There is insufficient explanation of existing treatment models, and it is unclear why the CHIME Model is introduced.

As for the actual HERMESS Model, the visual provided leaves me with questions. According to the structure of the model, each component is sequentially related, as the arrows would indicate a sequential order. This seems incorrect. In the explanation of the model, there are no references nor is there any data to support the components of the model. Additionally, the model includes components that address individual recovery processes as well as components that address organizational values. In this case, this inconsistency weakens the entire model. Furthermore, under the concept of self-sustainability, public funds and private donations are suggested. These two suggestions are the antithesis of self-sustainability.

Finally, and most crucially, the manuscript utilizes stigmatizing language. The authors should revise the entire manuscript to include person-first, destigmatized language. Of particular note, the conclusion states that people with substance use disorders and/or people in recovery from substance use disorders want "[t]o be persons again." This comment suggests that they are not, in fact, people, which is deeply problematic.

The entire manuscript needs to be entirely reconsidered.