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Reviewer's report:

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. I have also difficulty of understanding what "a narrative systematic literature review" means which needs to be defined or elaboration.

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).

Editorial issues

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

Reference style

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

Background (page 4)

Key observations

Background section lacks depth. Here are some reasons on why I said so:

- In the background section you wanted to introduce your readers to 3 distinct problems (risky sexual practice, drug misuse and alcohol consumption) in adolescents in Iran all at once.
However, each one of them is a complex issue which could be studied. It would have been good if you study each of the issues alone. I may come to that in the method section.

- It would have been better if you introduce the problem from the globe or at least, start from sub-continent and go to Iran.

- You did not also justify adequately why the problem needs to be studied. What health and other socio-economic problems arise as a result of these problems. Are these priority public health problems? If you could highlight problem statement and back it with some evidences, readers will get a sense of why the problem needs to be studied.

- You gave the readers the impression that the 3 problems can be lumped together into one. While each problem is linked to the other or could be a risk factor to the other or have common risk or protective factors, each needs to be discussed separately.

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.

* (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.

* You mentioned (124) that articles up to March 2018 were considered. Why not 2019? and when is the beginning of review? Readers would like to know such details. Why are you considering such years likes articles from 2013/14-2018? That needs some justification on your part.

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.

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

- Moreover, we know from experience that high risk behaviors are correlated with socio-demographic characteristics mainly age

- You have not also reported on biases

Result

- The result is extremely brief and not informative. Discussion should include from the description of results and summarily present the key findings.
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