

Determination of the Psychometric Properties of the Inventory of Drug Use Consequences (INDUC) and Its Relationship with General Health (GHQ-28) in an Iranian Population

Fatemeh. Tarzi¹, Jalil. Younisi Broujeni^{2*}, Ali. Fathi³

¹ Master's degree, Department of Psychology and Social Sciences, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Professor, Department of Measurement and Assessment, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

³ Department of Psychology and Social Sciences, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: jalilyounesi@gmail.com

Editor

Şennur Tutarel Kışlak¹

Department of Psychology/Faculty of Language, History and Geography, University of Ankara, Ankara, Turkey
kislak@ankara.edu.tr

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Hassan Ghanifar²

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Birjand, Iran. Email: ghanifar@iaubir.ac.ir

Reviewer 2: Abotaleb Saadati Shamir³

Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, University of Science and Research, Tehran, Iran. Email: psychology@iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The manuscript cites digital environments as influencing substance use (“Recent research highlights the role of digital environments and social media...”). However, this theme is not integrated into the research model or discussion. The authors should either explicitly connect this concept to the purpose of validating INDUC or remove this tangential discussion.

The claim “Existing tools often emphasize diagnostic criteria while overlooking functional impairment” is important but currently unsupported. Please cite specific instruments and briefly indicate their limitations to reinforce the argument for INDUC’s necessity.

The restriction of the sample to male participants only (“Inclusion criteria consisted of male gender”) requires a stronger theoretical and methodological justification. Please explain whether this was due to institutional constraints or research design considerations, and discuss its implications for external validity.

Table 1 reports that 49.2% of participants are aged 31–35, producing a heavily skewed age distribution. Please comment on how this concentration may influence factor stability and normative interpretations.

Item 13 shows very low communality (0.238). Please justify why this item was retained despite falling below commonly accepted thresholds (≥ 0.30 or ≥ 0.40).

Item 25 shows a non-significant loading ($\beta = -0.030$, C.R. = -0.557). The authors state the model is strong despite this. Please justify why this item was not removed or revised and discuss its implications for construct purity.

Several correlations exceed 0.80 (e.g., Interpersonal \leftrightarrow Physical = 0.840). Please address potential multicollinearity and discuss whether these constructs remain empirically distinct.

Although correlations are significant, they are moderate in magnitude (e.g., $r = 0.513$). Please avoid causal language in interpretation and clarify that these associations support convergent validity, not predictive inference.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The authors describe the study as an “instrument development investigation,” yet the INDUC already exists. Please clarify that this is a cross-cultural validation study rather than true instrument development to avoid conceptual misclassification.

The manuscript states “several modifications were implemented” during INDUC development. However, it remains unclear whether any modifications were made in the current Persian version. Please explicitly state whether translation, cultural adaptation, or item modification occurred in this study and describe the procedures.

While exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses are reported, no criteria for model fit (e.g., CFI, TLI, RMSEA, SRMR) are stated in this section. Please specify the fit indices and thresholds adopted for evaluating CFA models.

The introduction of a second-order factor model is theoretically meaningful; however, the authors do not explain why this structure was tested. Please provide the theoretical rationale for assuming a higher-order latent construct of “Drug Use Consequences.”

The positive correlation between response honesty and severity ($r = 0.64$) suggests potential method bias. Please discuss whether socially desirable responding or response style effects could inflate associations.

The Physical subscale shows the lowest alpha (0.735). Please comment on whether this meets acceptable psychometric standards for clinical decision-making and whether further refinement is recommended.

Norms are derived from a single-center, male-only clinical sample. Please explicitly caution against generalizing these norms to the broader Iranian population.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.