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Reviewer's report:

The authors have globally given satisfactory responses to the reviewers’ feedback.

There are still, however, some minor points that need clarification.

Discretionary Revisions

1/ If I understand the figures provided by the authors, the prevalence of non response for HED among soccer players is of 327/(327+3315)=3.5%, as compared to 41/(41+1788)=2.2% among other team sports players. While statistically significant, the difference is small enough to have an important impact on the results and I leave it to the authors to decide if they want to discuss it in the article.

2/ It seems that among the 98 students reporting fictitious drug use, sports status is missing for 35 students, 29 are non-team sports players? The interesting table to analyze would have been:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fictitious drug use report</th>
<th>No fictitious drug use report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non players</td>
<td>Soccer players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other team sports players</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, this point is not crucial for the article and the authors can chose to ignore it.

3/ In table 1, I suggest the use of “p<0,001” instead of “p=0,000”.

Minor Essential Revisions

4/ Section 2.1. The authors have well clarified the selection process of the analyzed questionnaires and the reasons for exclusion of some of these. The text is clear enough and the inclusion of the flow chart in the manuscript is not necessary.

I suggest a minor modification in the description: instead of just saying "those with missing data to any variables (n=3752)", specifying the variables and the number of students concerned would reassure the reader, as, if I understand correctly, there are only 3 variables implied and missing values on HED – the
most critical variable – are seldom. For instance: "those with missing age (n=1835), sports practice (n=3425) or HED (n=325)".

However, the authors must clarify if the 1835 figure refers to students excluded because their age was missing, or to students excluded because they were not aged from 14 to 18. Some typos need to be corrected too, “as well who practiced non-team sports” should read “as well as those who practiced non team-sports” and “the final sample considered in this study was from 9886” should read “the final sample size was 9886.”

5/ Although the need for adjustments for multiple comparisons is subject to debate, type I error inflation is not just a “possibility”. I suggest that the authors change their sentence (e.g. “When multiple statistical comparisons are carried out, as in this paper, the impact of type I error inflation could be taken into account”).

6/ I am unsure about the use of “used as adjust”, I suggest rephrasing to “There are other variables that exert influence on drug use (...) and that were not controlled for in this manuscript”.
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