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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory revisions

1. Considering that the data can not be generalized, the authors should review some statements such as, in page 04, “in order to describe ecstasy use patterns in the Netherlands…”

2. The composition of the sample is not clear. The authors recruited 160 participants, called randomly to fill five focus groups with 24 (24 in each group or in all?). If only 24 were interviewed, what happened with the other subjects? (Did they refuse? How about the limitations associated with this refusal?). How were the other 8 subjects recruited?

3. Methods must be better detailed (or reviewed). Why only 8 subjects were individually interviewed (why not all 32?)? How many non users, users and ex-users composed each group (individual interviews and FGDs)?

4. What is the relation between the article and Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 (supplementary files)? The tables are not mentioned in the text; Do they belong to the study?

5. Conclusions are not based on all the data observed. Considering the diversity of the studied situations (non users, users and ex-users), the authors focused the study on ceasing ecstasy use and harm reduction as an intervention for cessation. I suggest discussion concerning other possible interventions (prevention) based on non user reports.

Minor essential revision

1. Methods: The acronym FGDs must be specified at the first paragraph.

Discretionary revisions

1. I recommend the authors review the title. “Career in ecstasy use” suggests a longitudinal study.

2. Individual interviews provide different contents compared to FGDs. So these different contents should be analyzed from different perspectives.

3. The authors should consider other relevant Dutch data concerning ecstasy use (and ecstasy use cessation), such as the “Next Study” (for example, Vervaeke et al., 2007). I recommend also reading Sydow et al. (2002).
4. Limitations should be presented with more details.
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