



Comparison of Executive Functions and Resilience in Two Groups of Cannabis Users and Non-Users

Ezzatollah Ahmadi¹, Mahdi Chitsaz^{2*}

¹ Associate professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Science and Psychology, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran

² M.A in General Psychology, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: amiraliahmadi91@yahoo.com

E d i t o r

Özgür Eken
Associate Professor, Inonu
University, Malatya, Turkey
ozgureken86@gmail.com

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Zahra Naghsh
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.
Email: z.naghsh@ut.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Yaghob Badriazarin
Associate Professor of Sport Sciences, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran.
Email: badriazarin@tbzmed.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Date: 02 June 2024

Reviewer:

The statement "Cannabis is one of the most commonly used drugs and due to its diverse cognitive and psychological effects it has attracted researchers' attention (1 2)" (Introduction, Paragraph 1) lacks specificity. Please elaborate on the types of cognitive and psychological effects that have been observed in previous studies.

The description of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale mentions "components such as personal competence, trust in personal instincts" (Methods and Materials, Resilience) without explaining how these components were operationalized. Provide details on the specific items or subscales used.

The explanation of MANOVA use, "Given the normality of the data and the homogeneity of variances" (Data Analysis, Paragraph 1), lacks depth. Please include tests and results (e.g., Levene's test) that confirm these assumptions were met.

Table 1 presents means and standard deviations without confidence intervals. Please include confidence intervals to better convey the precision of the estimates.

The sentence "A significant difference was observed in behavioral inhibition between cannabis users and non-users ($F = 4.5$, $Sig = 0.03$)" (Findings and Results, Paragraph 2) should include effect size to provide a sense of the magnitude of the difference.

The discussion mentions "no significant difference in problem-solving and resilience" (Discussion and Conclusion, Paragraph 1) but does not explore potential reasons or implications for these non-significant results. Please elaborate on possible explanations and implications for future research.

The study refers to "Executive functions" and "Resilience" without linking them to a theoretical framework. Please provide a theoretical basis for why these constructs were chosen and how they are related to cannabis use.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Date: 05 June 2024

Reviewer:

In the sentence "Some demonstrated that marijuana use is associated with decreased working memory and attention (3-8)" (Introduction, Paragraph 2), please provide more specific details about the methodologies and findings of these studies to strengthen the argument.

The hypotheses of the study are not explicitly stated. Please include a clear statement of the hypotheses in the introduction or methods section to guide the reader.

The criteria "no severe physical or psychological illnesses" (Methods and Materials, Paragraph 1) need more specificity. Define what constitutes severe illnesses and how they were assessed.

The limitations section states, "First, causality cannot be inferred from comparative studies" (Discussion and Conclusion, Paragraph 2). Expand on this by discussing how future longitudinal studies could address this limitation.

The ethical considerations are briefly mentioned as "Informed consent obtained from all participants" (Ethics Considerations, Paragraph 1). Please include more details on how confidentiality and data protection were ensured.

The discussion section lacks integration with the broader literature. For instance, compare and contrast your findings with studies like "Meier et al., 2012" (Introduction, Paragraph 2) to contextualize your results within existing research.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.