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Author's response to reviews:

Point By Point Response to Referee

First of all I would like to thank the editorial team of the journal and the reviewers for working hard to improve the scientific merit of our research and contributing to make it accessible to the largest scientific community.

Point By Point Response to Referee 1

1. The name of the organization UoG, CMHS, DoN is deleted which was written at the beginning.

2. It is very difficult to change the title of the research. The smartest way to write a topic is using the striking finding of the research like I did: High prevalence of substance use. I understand that the objective is to determine the prevalence of substance use identifying factors associated with substance use. I thought the title best expresses our research work.

3. Affiliation is included below the list of authors.

4. Thank you. I made sure that all the authors contributing to the research work are included

5. I made sure that the email address of all the authors are right

6. The postal address of the researchers is included.

7. The word lightning is deleted on the introduction section of the abstract

8. The comment given in the method and result section of the abstract is incorporated

9. In the result section of the abstract, I cannot delete the OR and CI because in the result section it is a must to put it but as you propose, the OR and CI will be removed in the conclusion section.

10. The comments given in the method section are corrected.

11. The comments given in the result section are incorporated. However, “Odd of Substance use increased by 3 fold with sibling’s use of substances” this is one way of interpretation.
12. Here is the response to the question raised on paragraph four of the discussion section ‘Do really alcohol drinking by those high school students (specified age group) socially acceptable’. Alcohol is a socially acceptable drink in the community. One way to that we can confirm is the formal availability the available alcoholic drink in holidays (Ethiopian Epiphany, new year celebration Easter), weeding ceremony party and banquet (Ceremony prepared in the honor of Saint Gebreal, Saint Mariam, saint, etc). It is acceptable to drink since it is made ready for that purpose.

13. Comments given in the discussion and limitation were corrected

14. Thank you for the comment “Who should be acknowledged? Usually sponsor organization, data collectors and study participants.” Those who gave technical and general support can be acknowledged. This was the reason we included the persons in the acknowledgment.

Point By Point Response to Referee 1

1. The conclusion is changed to conclusion and recommendation in the abstract

2. The sampling technique is there one paragraph below the operation definition saying ‘Stratified random sampling technique was used to select the study participant from each grade considering population proportion to sample size. Finally respondents were selected using computer generated random number.’

3. It is edited now

4. It is replaced by “Primary full cycle school’ now

5. The sample size formula used used was mentioned on the first paragraph after the operational definition section of the method that is the single population proportion formula. But we thought that if we mentioned the single population proportion formula, the formula ( ) is understood. In addition, the assumptions used to calculate the sample size were included in the paragraph next to operational definition in the following way. “ The sample size was determined using the formula to estimate a single population proportion based on the following assumptions: level of confidence to be 95%, 4% margin of error, and the lifetime and 30 days prevalence of substance use; for alcohol drinking is 45.7% and 26.5%, cigarette smoking 11.5% and 5.6%, and khat chewing 16% and 7.8% respectively The proportion for lifetime alcohol drinking was taken to get the maximum sample size. The final minimum sample size (n) became 684 considering 15% non response rate.”

The final sample size was also included in the same paragraph. It is 684.

6. ‘Sensational seeking behavior’ is taken as a justification is from literatures. Yes it is a proven factor.

7. The reader will take both of them since both of them are different. The first one is the current use (the last 30 months before the data collection) of all the three substances at the same time. Whereas the lifetime prevalence the use of the all the three substances in the lifetime (any one time in the respondents life). It is clearly mentioned in the operational definition. This is thus to kindly explain that
both have difference.

8. I had grown up in the area where the study was conducted. Alcoholic drinks are prepared/made ready to warm the holiday. The alcoholic drinks are given with the food to the family. Adolescent students have also access and freedom to drink thought not similar with adults. The direct response for this question is ‘yes’ I have witnessed that students have access to drink alcoholic drinks.

Responses to minor essential revisions comments

1. References are now included
2. The awareness creation education was given to students. It was to mean awareness creation activities were performed after the data collection period and also based on the result of the finding. Your comment is addressed now
3. It is the journals instruction to put the table at the end of the document and hence it is found there.
4. Thank you for the comment the current prevalence for all the three substances use was 27(4.1%). Whereas the life time prevalence for the three substances was 107 (16.4%). Please note that the current and life time use of the substances should be seen independently. It should not be summed.
5. Thank you for the comment it is corrected now.

Response to the Editors’ Comment:
# We have tried to copyedit the language of the manuscript with English language expert.