February 10, 2009

Institutional Review Board

Texas State University – San Marcos

Re: IRB Application 2009W893

Dear Committee Members,

Thank you for your time and care in reviewing our submission entitled: “Psychological and Neurocognitive Correlates of Stimulant Misuse in Young Adults”. In order to address the concerns of the reviewers, we have made changes to the consent form and proposal synopsis. We have included the reviewer’s comments in italics and my replies, along with an explanation of the changes made to the relevant procedures or documents below.

Before that, though I wanted to draw the reviewer’s attention to a change made to the consent form that was not specifically requested during IRB review. During the process of applying for a Certificate of Confidentiality from the National Institute on Drug Abuse for a separate study conducted by the PI (2009U5299), the PI was informed that any language indicating mandated reporting of certain events (abuse, neglect, etc.) to state agencies was inconsistent with a Certificate of Confidentiality.

They requested that wording be changed to let participants know that the PI would report abuse, neglect, suicidality or homicidality, as opposed to language indicating that the PI must report these events. As such, the original language, “Please be aware that if you report any information suggesting that you may either hurt yourself or hurt somebody else, we will **be required to** notify the appropriate authorities. Additionally, investigators **must** report certain cases of child or elder abuse or neglect to the appropriate authorities”, was changed to “Please be aware that if you report any information suggesting that you may either hurt yourself or hurt somebody else, we **will** notify the appropriate authorities. Additionally, investigators **will** report certain cases of child or elder abuse or neglect to the appropriate authorities.” This is consistent with both state law and the requirements to obtain a Certificate of Confidentiality, which the PI intends to seek for this study.

**Reviewer #1**

1. *I think there should be a more specific description of cognitive and psychological traits that will be examined [in the consent form].*

**PI Reply:** These traits are listed in the Purpose section of the consent form: “impulsive personality, impulsive responding, risk-taking, self-control, perceived stress, coping with stress and anxiety.” We are concerned about adding further detail for fear that participants will alter their responses to fall in line with what the experimenters expect. This is the social psychological phenomenon of responding to *demand characteristics*. Also, we were somewhat unclear about how to be more specific, as many of the traits or characteristics listed have relatively face valid definitions.

1. *In the first sentence under EEG appointment (p.2) [in the consent form] add the word \'we\' after the first comma. We will apply....*

**PI Reply:** This was done, per request.

1. *Compensation is described slightly differently in the proposal (item 7 $15/hr X 4 hours) than in the consent....\"$30 for participation in each appointment... for a total of $60. These should be the same.*

**PI Reply:** The proposal synopsis was changed to make it consistent with the wording of the consent form.

1. *Because of the sensitive nature of the information required from participants, it might be a good idea to place the information on confidentiality toward the beginning of the Risks and Inconveniences section.*

**PI Reply:** The section on confidentiality was moved to immediately follow the Risks and Inconveniences section, and the items in this section were reordered to put the confidentiality-related concerns (completion of self-report forms) first.

1. *Paragraph 1. last sentence: Participants will deny... I think would be clarified by stating that \'participants with any current psychiatric illness at screening will be eliminated\'.*

**PI Reply:** Per the reviewer’s suggestion, the wording of this sentence was changed.

1. *Bottom of p. 2- Novel, non-target stimuli will be presented with a probablitlity of .10; whereas, the target stimuli will be presented with a probability of .10. These appear to be the same, so I\'m unclear about the whereas? (page numbers would be nice).*

**PI Reply:** We apologize that this was unclear. The word whereas was removed, and page numbers were added to aid review.

**Reviewer #2**

1. *I only request that the investigator assure me that the text of his ad on Craigslist will be identical to the text on the flyer included in the documentation. If it is different, please submit the text of the Craigslist ad.*

**PI Reply:** The advertisement on Craigslist will use the same wording as the text of the included flyer. If we find that we need to change the wording of the flyer, a Change application will be made with the IRB to obtain approval prior to posting an amended advertisement.

1. *Also, please submit a list of the questions and statements to be used for the initial telephone screening interview.*

**PI Reply:** A copy of the phone screen will be attached with this resubmission, per request.

Thank you again for your time and concern about our project.

Best wishes,

Ty Schepis, Ph.D.

Reiko Graham, Ph.D.

Natalie Ceballos, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology