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Author's response to reviews:

We would like to thank all reviewers and editors of BMC Public Health for investing their expertise and time and for providing substantive comments to our manuscript. Based on your recommendation we have revised and edited the manuscript line by line and the response for each reviewer is stated below.

Reviewer's report

Title: Psychoactive Substances Use and Associated Factors among Axum University Students, Axum Town, North Ethiopia

Version: 3 Date: 28 June 2013

Reviewer: Lucio G Oliveira

Reviewer's report:

The authors adequately answered my observations, and I take the time to congratulate them for the manuscript content improvement after reviewing. The manuscript content keeps on being interesting, however, I still believe that some topics deserve the authors’ attention.

Major Compulsory Revisions: there are too many grammatical and typographical errors yet.
All grammatical and typographical errors were reviewed, edited and corrected accordingly by the authors and an English expert.

Minor Essential Revisions:
In the background section, the authors have stated that drug use is a rising public health problem; however, this idea is supported only by regional studies.
# The idea is supported by many local, regional and international studies. In addition what is available in our manuscript, we have provided additional global references like “WHO”.
In the background and method sections, the terms “drug use” and “drug abuse” seemed to be used with the same meaning in the text. Authors are encouraged to review the use of such terms.
# We have revised and edited the whole manuscript according to your substantive recommendation.
Also, authors continue unnecessarily transcribing the results of other studies whose outcomes were consistent with the manuscript.
# We have modified the manuscript, especially the discussion part accordingly
Finally, the authors mentioned about polydrug use among college students. Perhaps that is a topic of interest to be better discussed in the manuscript.
# The manuscript is revised and all necessary things related to our objective are well discussed
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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Reviewer: Amy Jeffers
Reviewer's report:
In general, it seems the authors made many necessary revisions. However, I still have a few comments/suggestions as noted below.
Minor Essential Revisions:
1. The manuscript’s language is improved, but might be worth having another English speaker edit it as there are still language and grammatical errors. Also, please don’t use the abbreviation “b/c” in the Recommendations section.
# All grammatical and typographical errors were reviewed, edited and corrected
accordingly by the authors and an English expert.

# The unnecessary abbreviations are removed and corrected.

2. There is still inconsistency when using the terms “substance use” versus “substance abuse,” and this is seen throughout the manuscript, especially in the abstract and introduction.

# We have revised and edited the whole manuscript according to your substantive comments and recommendations.

3. There are still unnecessary statistics in the discussion section (sd, AOR, CI). These are not needed even when describing results of other studies.

# The discussion part is critically revised and edited according to your substantive comments.

4. Although the manuscript has been shortened, it still reads long and could be even further streamlined. It would be helpful to get to the main points quicker, especially in the results and discussion questions.

# We have tried to shorten the manuscript accordingly.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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