12 March 2012

Dear Ms Downing,

**RE: A comparative study of the effects of methamphetamine on memory in existing and recovering addicts from a South African population.**

Thank you for the opportunity to perform the revisions provided in your letter dated 10 February 2012. I have edited the article accordingly and have listed the alterations done accordingly below.

Please note that the ‘track changes’ feature was utilised to link these points with the actual revisions in the article.

1. Page 4: the editor requested the author to expose the ‘gap’ in current knowledge about the use of tik and phrase this as a problem statement to justify the study. The author has redefined the section in accordance with this. Changes are noted in the track changes margin.
2. Page 6: The author shortened and condensed the objectives of the study and added them to the background information as requested by the reviewers.
3. Page 8: the objective of the study was placed correctly and the objectives section was revised as requested by the editor. The bullets were removed and highlighted sections removed.
4. Page 7: the study significance was shortened and edited as requested by the reviewers.
5. Page 8: the sample of the study was edited and inclusion and exclusion criteria included according to the guidelines provided by the reviewers. An explanation was provided of how participants were identified and through which selection process they were chosen.
6. Page 9: The reviewer requested information regarding which areas in Gauteng were used and a line was added to this section to aid in the elucidation of the matter.
7. Page 9: The reviewers requested information regarding the treatment professionals and potential incentives used in the study. A line was added to clarify information regarding the treatment professionals and the line regarding incentives was removed. This is because no incentives were actively used during the study – vouchers for clothing or food stores (no cash) were offered to recovering addicts that were no longer in treatment but participants were instead referred by treatment facilities.
8. Page 9: The reviewers had questions regarding the sobriety of the recovering addicts and these concerns were addressed in a paragraph on pages 9-10. Although advertisments were placed in local universities, no matched control participants were obtained this way. Instead they were referred by peers who understood the control criteria and who were aware of people of equal age, education and gender as the experimental groups.
9. Page 10-11: The age distribution and gender table were moved as the editor indicated they were not applicable where they were originally placed. As they are not results but merely define the sample selected, they were moved to the methodology section.
10. Pages 11-14: the reviewers indicated that the Instruments section needed to be shortened and the reliability and validity moved from page 16 to the relevant section. This was done.
11. Page 15: Ethics section was moved to the end of the methodology section as requested by the reviewers.
12. Pages 16-18: The table format was edited and headings provided to each table as requested by the reviewers.
13. Page 19: The discussion - The reviewer suggested that findings discussed in the conclusion must tally with those outlined in the results section. Throughout the discussion section alterations were made to make the section more fluid and references to the results sections were added to elucidate the discussion more clearly.

If you require any additional information from me, please do not hesitate to ask.

Kind regards,

Cindy van Wyk