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Report.

A review on the manuscript: Predictors of the late onset of cannabis and other drug use in male adult.

Reviewer: Hrefna Pálsdóttir

1. Discretionary Revisions

• The word “investigate” is often used, it could be better to use “explore” or “study”
• Under Abstract (8th paragraph) – “baseline lifetime use” you could be a bit clearer in what you mean by that, describe it better.

2. Minor Essential Revisions:

• The description of “sample” is unclear. The chapter called: “Participants” is mostly describing the “sample” and the chapter called: “Enrolment Procedure” is mostly describing the participants.
• Under the chapter: “Measures” - The variables “health” and “personality” need a clearer description on the scales being used in accordance to other scales used
• It could be clearer to describe it better why you need to assess or why it is important whether participants have not started, started, finished or discontinued military training, in the chapter “Attendance of military training school”.

3. Major Compulsory Revisions

• The research question is missing or you could have the goal of the study a bit clearer.
• The interpretation is clear and the relevance of the results are discussed. The chapter on limitations is on the other hand rather weak. Could for example “self report” be a limitation to the research? Or environmental changes? The strength of the study is not mentioned either. For example you have a great access to the young men, who are representative of the young men living in in Switzerland.
• The conclusion drawn from the study points only to the benefits of the study or implications for practice / the findings of the study – for example why it is important to screen for these young male adults - are missing. The conclusion is
supposed to be valid and result from the data shown. It could be useful to look at more references to other relevant work to strengthen the conclusion.

- The chapter “Participants” is a bit unclear and confusing. It could be better to describe the process in a table instead of a full-text. It would also be clearer to have the total participants in each category in a table.
- What is missing is to mention (and describe better) the self-reported questionnaires, where did the young men fill them out, did they all do it at the same time and to describe the booklet. You could also mention how the 15th months follow-up was implemented.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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