



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_38304
Title of the Manuscript:	The prevalence of substance abuse and its mental health effects among the youth: Implications for social research
New Title of the Manuscript:	Substance abuse and its mental health effects among the youth: implications for social research.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>See the Journal website and re-write the Abstract and References. (eg. reference numbers 6, 9 and 10).</p> <p>There are two sets of participants in this study. This should be taken into consideration when results are presented, analysed and discussed. Was the same study tool used for the two sets of participants? Enclose the study tool. Compare the findings from the two sets of participants.</p> <p>The introduction and discussion sections focused more on prevalence. This should be reviewed. With the way the participants were selected, prevalence should not be a finding or the focus of the study.</p> <p>Based on the limitations of the study as presented, include Botswana in the Title of the study.</p> <p>Explain the analysis of data. How many themes emerged from the study?</p> <p>Only two quotes were included in the manuscript, why?</p>	<p>The Abstract as well as Reference section has been revised according to the journal requirements.</p> <p>We have enclosed the study tool as per suggestion from review. The study had two groups of participants, and the interview guide was closely related though it was not one and the same thing. During analysis we grouped the same themes together from both youth participants and key informants. However, we have also acknowledged the limitation of having few participants in this present study. Kindly see the main document.</p> <p>We duly appreciate and acknowledge this recommendation. Our intention was to provide prevalence in the background of the study in order to emphasize that this is an issue of major concern and it needs to be investigated. Nevertheless, we also realised the limitation that the method used for data collection was not suitable to report on the prevalence, this is one of the reasons the title of the paper has also been changed to remove the word prevalence.</p> <p>This has since been done; we have included Botswana in the Title of the paper.</p> <p>Four themes emerged from the study being: Substance abuse among youth in Serowe, Botswana; Link between mental health and substance abuse; Mental health effects of substance abuse among the youth; Service in place to assist the mentally disturbed as a result of substance abuse. Of all the above major themes, there were sub-themes within the major themes as succinctly indicated in the revised document.</p> <p>At first we had many quotes and we had to remove some in order to avoid much quotes (Over quoting).</p>



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

<p>Endeavour to establish a link between the theoretical framework and the objectives and findings of the study.</p> <p>Was there an Ethical approval for the Study. Re-write the ethical consideration section.</p> <p>Why this assertion that males abuse substances more than females when snowballing method was used to select the participants?</p> <p>Review the referencing style using reference numbers 25 and 26 in the body of the manuscript. Presentation of reference number 26 is preferred. Also, According to [7,3,8]. This should be reviewed.</p> <p>Participants profile, indicate the age ranges, number of years on drugs and whether the participants have sought medical help before. etc</p> <p>Explain in the body of the manuscript why in-depth interview was preferred over FGD in collecting data from the youths.</p> <p>Review the manuscript for errors of grammar.</p>	<p>However, we have since increased the number of quotes.</p> <p>On this aspect, the theory was used to predict and explain the objectives of the study. The link has been thoroughly explained on the discussion chapter. We discussed the study findings taking into consideration the study objectives, literature review and the theory.</p> <p>The study was given Ethical approval by University of Botswana Review Board. See attached copy of research permit.</p> <p>We duly acknowledge this observation and we have since removed that conclusion as the study used non-probability sampling. If the study had used probability sampling where all participants stood equal chance of being selected perhaps that's when the assertion would surface. However, as mentioned above we have removed our previous assertion.</p> <p>We have re-written this section as per the journal guideline. All references have been revised to fit the requirements of the journal.</p> <p>We have added participant's profiles in the paper under findings section. We have even clarified in the text the part on whether they have sought medical assistance before. Some of the participants have done so whereas others have not.</p> <p>This has also been noted. We have clarified in the text the rational for selecting in-depth interviews as compared to FGD. For instance, looking at the nature of the topic we were dealing with, we believed that in-depth interview offers a relaxed atmosphere as people will find it easy and comfortable in an relaxed environment by having conversation with one to one rather than FGD where often one would not be comfortable to disclose their personal affairs in front of other people. Kindly see the methodology section for more detailed explanation.</p> <p>This has also been done.</p>
--	---