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Author's response to reviews:

Page 6, paragraph about Experimental Users...
The reviewer found it confusing that, of three groups 'non-users', 'experimental users' and 'non-users', the 'experimental users' were also ex-users. He suggested that the term 'experimental users' was changed to clarify that they these individuals were also ex-users but that their use had been lighter than those classed as 'ex-users'. As this has not been changed, it might be worth seeking his advise on this. The authors have provided a reference to a paper in response to his comment but the paper does not help clarify the issue if it is confusing to readers. It is particularly important as 'experimental users' is used in the title of the paper.

- We replaced the terms: “experimental users” to “ex-users light” and the term “Ex-users” to “Ex-users moderate”.

A couple of other very minor points from myself that it may be worth addressing:

1. Ex-users are defined as those who had 'consumed ecstasy more than five times during their lifetime...';, yet in the next sentence it says 'the cutoff point was based on qualitative studies that have defined these specific drug users as people who have used ecstasy five or more times'. The 'experimental user' group has a cut off of use up to four times in their lifetime, so individuals using just five times in their lifetime could not be included in either group. It may just be a mistake and 'ex users' meant to be five or more times as per the reference provided.

- We include: use until five times.
2. On page 13, there is an acronym 'EX' that needs correcting to either 'EXP' or 'EX-US'
   - We include: “L”.

3. Could the authors clarify the codes used after the quotes provided?
   E.g. (Exusaf24), (Nusacf24) - these appear to be a combination of group (e.g. EX-US), gender and age, but there is an additional letter or two in the codes that are unexplained. It may be better if the same acronyms as in the text were used and the additional letters excluded, so (if I’m correct), the examples would read (EX-US,f,24) (NU,f,24)
   - We took the initials of the names and just let the group, sex and age.