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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer1:

Q1: Line 37-38, please elaborate on the association of these behaviors in text and explain why these behaviors were examined together. Please also explain whether the identified factors in this review apply to all these behaviors.

A1: Dear referee:

It explained in abstract line 37-38 and highlighted. Also It explained in text line 114-123 and 136-137 and highlighted.

The identified factors in this review apply to all these behaviors expect one sub theme which is highlighted in table 2 and explained under the table2 (line 605).

Q2:Line 105-108: Please elaborate on how and why the results of interventions are inconsistent. Please add references as well.

A2: There was an error in translation that was corrected and references added and highlighted (line 162-163).

Q3: Line 133: Please elaborate on why only adolescents between the ages of 15 to 19 are selected.
A3: It explained in line 191-192 and highlighted.

Q4: In the abstract, the authors indicated that 5 main theme and 40 sub-themes were identified. However, these results were not reported in the results section.

A4: It corrected in line 47-48 and highlighted.

Q5: Since the results and discussion were not separate, it was difficult for the reader to distinguish which were the results of this literature review.

A5: It corrected in results in line 222-268 and highlighted. Also it corrected in discussion and highlighted.

Q6: The authors have identified various factors affecting the behaviors, however, it was unclear why the authors concluded that family can reduce the negative effects of the identified areas.

A6: It explained in conclusion in line 378-383, 386-390 and highlighted.

Reviewer2:

Q1: Title: The problem for the research starts with the title or with the selection of doing a systematic review for 3 issues. The problem for me is that even doing systematic review of determinants for one of them, for example, alcohol use is a tough task.

A1: Dear referee:

This manuscript was extracted from my Ph.D thesis.

My PhD thesis is about these three behaviors in adolescents. In order to prevent Salami slicing three behaviors are discussed in the manuscript.

In addition evidence suggests that these behaviors are coincidence. So all of these behaviors were examined together. It explained in abstract line 37-38 and highlighted. Also it explained in text line 114-123 and 136-137 and highlighted.
Q2: Title: I have also difficulty of understanding what "a narrative systematic literature review" means which needs to be defined or elaboration.

A2: There was an error in translation that was corrected in title and highlighted.

Q3: Abstract

33: We now have better way of classifying countries than classifying countries as "developing" and "developed". Countries are divided as "low income" and "middle income" countries or based on their socio-development index (SDI).

A3: It corrected in abstract (line 34) and in text in lines 124, 142 and highlighted.

Q4: Editorial issues

124: The review of articles was done till March 2018. The articles start from which year?

A4: Articles from Iran’s revolution (1979) up to March 30, 2018 were included in this review. It is explained in line 179-180 and highlighted.

Q5: Reference style

187: it seems that you are not consistent in your referencing style

A5: It is corrected in line 295-296 and highlighted.

Q6: Background section lacks depth.

A6: It explained in background in line 99-141

Q7: Research method (page 5)

I have the following observations

* Since you are submitting your research to the English language journal, I would kindly suggest, journals in Persian language should not be considered in your review. While the articles in Persian language could have scientifically robust evidence, your English language reader will
not have the benefit of accessing and referring the Persian Language publications. That is quite a limitation. I suggest Persian language articles go to the list of exclusion criteria.

A7: Persian language articles excluded from study, and other languages except English language go to the list of exclusion criteria. (table 1 highlighted)

Q8: Research method (page 5)

I have the following observations:

121, 124), page 5 you mentioned that "grey literature was also searched". However, you only discussed published literature in your information/data source. I kindly suggest only published and peer reviewed articles have better quality for systematic reviews.

A8: Grey literature was searched in order to prevent publication bias. They were irrelevant to the title and abstract so that they were excluded from the study. It explained in line 203-204.

Q9: Research method (page 5)

I have the following observations:

You mentioned (124) that articles up to March 2018 were considered. Why not 2019?

A9: This manuscript was extracted from my Ph.D thesis. I searched articles up to March 2018, and then I entered the analysis phase and simultaneously, I was writing my Ph.D thesis. So preparing this article took time. I submitted the manuscript in February 14, 2019.

Q10: Research method (page 5)

I have the following observations:

When is the beginning of review? Readers would like to know such details. Why are you considering such years like articles from 2013/14-2018? That needs some justification on your part.

A10: Articles from Iran’s revolution (1979) up to March 30, 2018 were included in this review. It is explained in line 179-180 and highlighted.

It explained in line 181-183 and highlighted.
Q11: Quality of includes studies

(142), page 6 you mentioned quality of study (literature) was assessed by 2 investigators independently. You also indicated the reviewers used The Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist. I assume that the 25 articles you included in your review in Table 2 (page 23) "scored 50% or more in the quality assessment score". How is it done? You need to give us some details how you did it or elaborate a little bit.

A11: It explained in line 206-212 and highlighted.

More details:

For quality assessment of the articles, The Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist were used. Based on the type of articles the appropriate checklist was selected. For example for cross sectional studies, JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Analytical Cross Sectional Studies were used. Then two authors (VYF and N.O) individually evaluated each article based on the checklist. Based on the checklist, each author scored to each article individually. Studies with quality assessment score of 50% and higher were included in the final review. For example a cross-sectional study was evaluated by a cross-sectional checklist. The checklist has 8 questions. If the author (VYF) marked the 5 questions of the checklist yes, the article was entered into the study. If one of the author had given score 5 or higher to an article and the other one score less than 5 points, disagreement arose between the authors was resolved through discussion, and by involving the third author.

Q12: You also included few qualitative studies. I suggest it would have been good if you excluded the qualitative studies.

A12: Qualitative studies were excluded. It is highlighted in table 3.

Q13: You have not also reported on biases

A13: It explained in line 198-204 and highlighted.

Q14: Result

The result is extremely brief and not informative. Discussion should include from the description of results and summarily present the key findings.
A14: It corrected in results in line 222-268 and highlighted. Also It corrected in discussion and highlighted.