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Dear editorial team,

Hereby we resubmit our revised version of our revised manuscript “A structured review of reasons for ecstasy use and related behaviours - pointers for future research”.

We are happy that our previous revision was so positively received, and we have implemented all comments that the reviewers made regarding that previous revision. We are very grateful for the comments of all reviewers. For the sake of completeness and clarity, I have placed each reviewers’ comments, and my reaction on them, behind this page. The reviewers’ comments are in a box with an unbroken border, and my response in a box with a dashed border.

Kind regards, on behalf of all authors,

Gjalt-Jorn Ygram Peters
Reviewer: Michael Lyvers

Dear dr. Lyvers,

Thank you very much for these comments! I have implemented them all and am very grateful that you took the time to read the paper to thoroughly provide these comments!

I will remember to never again use ‘portait’ (as a verb at least), ‘explorative’ and ‘demographical’ . . . And I will never again advise that ‘fear of addition’ be measured, unless, perhaps, I should ever find myself involved in a study into primary school children’s arithmetic performance.

Kind regards, on behalf of all authors,

Gjalt-Jorn

PS: Your comments are in a box with an unbroken border, and my response in a box with a dashed border (like the one surrounding this text).

This article is a revision of a qualitative follow-up to a previously published meta-analysis by the same authors concerned with self-reported motives for using ecstasy, not trying ecstasy or ceasing ecstasy use. Ecstasy users are not a monolithic group and the motives for use are likely to vary between, say, dance party people and those who take MDMA for self-medication or self-exploration. Nevertheless the authors appear to have effectively summarized the relevant findings from journal articles to date. I would classify this article as one of interest limited to those specializing in motives for ecstasy use.

Minor essential revisions

p. 4, line 14: “portrait” should be “portray”
This revision has been implemented.

p. 5, line 9: “explorative” should be “exploratory”
This revision has been implemented.

p. 6, line 10: “demographical” should be “demographic”
This revision has been implemented.

p. 6, line 16: “recreative” should be “recreational”
This revision has been implemented.

p. 8, line 12: “each categories’” should be “each category’s”
This revision has been implemented.
Reviewer: Kelly Allott

Dear dr. Allott,

Thank you again for your kind comments. I am very grateful for your thinking along and your thorough and critical reading of this paper! I have implemented all your suggestions.

Kind regards, on behalf of all authors,

Gjalt-Jorn Peters

PS: below, I have reacted on your comments one by one. Your comments are in a box with an unbroken border, and my response in a box with a dashed border (like the one surrounding this text).

This revised version is significantly improved from the original version. However, there still remain some minor essential revisions that should be addressed prior to publication.

**Minor essential revisions**

1. Page 4 - "portrait" should be changed to "portray".
   
   This revision has been implemented.

2. Page 5 - first sentence of last paragraph of Background - "studied" should be changed to "reviewed".
   
   This revision has been implemented.

3. Page 7 - in listing the studies that addressed reasons for combining ecstasy with other drugs and applying harm reduction strategies, the authors include study 41, which is not discussed in this later section of the results. They also have not included study 28, which is discussed in this later results section. Please correct.
   
   You are absolutely right, we have checked this (indeed, it seems like I misread 41 for 28? Unlikely though it may seem . . .) and corrected this!

4. Page 8 - "...and then reasons in a reason category were..." - "then" should be changed to "when".
   
   This revision has been implemented.

5. Page 8 - Table 4 is a good addition to the paper and the use of symbols to signify relevance is helpful. However, the tick symbol to signify when no frequency information was available is misleading/confusing. Can the authors change this symbol to the letter "N" to signify 'No information'?
   
   We have changed this! You are right, especially as opposed to the cross symbol, the tick symbol seemed to signify that relevance was established, rather than that no information was available.
I think that confusion is caused by the fact that in the results section, on page 7, indeed, I discuss the studies that “addressed reasons for combining ecstasy with other drugs and applying harm reduction strategies [25, 28, 29, 35, 36, 40, 46].”

Then, on page 10, I discuss studies that “reported reasons to combine ecstasy with other drugs [29, 35, 36, 40, 46].”

Three sentences later, I discuss studies that “reported that people refrained from combining with other drugs to maximize the ecstasy experience (studies A [40] and K [28]).”

Again two sentences later, I discuss that “To minimize health risks, participants also pre- or postloaded with vitamins, 5-Hydroxytryptophan (5-HTP), or selective serotonin re-uptake inhibitors (SSRIs; studies O [36], Q [25] and R [29]).”

So, the confusion is created because I discuss the studies in a broader category the first time, whereas on page 10, dealing specifically with this category, I split this up. The first sentence, the one you are referring to, therefore deals only with the studies that reported reasons to combine ecstasy with other drugs. The remaining two studies report reasons to pre- or postload and to apply harm reduction strategies. Because clearly this is confusing, I now added a sentence to the beginning of this this paragraph:

“In total, seven studies reported reasons to combine ecstasy with other drugs, to apply harm reduction strategies, or to refrain from these behaviours.”

The “a” has been implemented.

This is a very good point. So good that I have decided to take out all the lists. After all, the Table 4 you suggested last time addresses this need for a list as well. I have therefore replaced the lists with these sentences:

"Ideally, for each behaviour, beliefs potentially underlying all reasons that have been studied (i.e. that have been marked in Table 4) are quantitatively examined. That way, over time, a clear picture will emerge as to the relative relevance of each of these reasons.”

"Allot" should be "Allott".

My apologies. I have corrected this.

The title of reference number 35 (Hansen et al., 2001) is incomplete.
This is strange, because this reference has been entered correctly into EndNote. In addition, in the EndNote preview screen (when having the ‘biomedcentral’ style selected), the reference appears correct. Hmm. I’ve changed the spelling of the title a little bit (placing spaces between the periods and the end of the ‘quote’ part of the title, and replacing the single quotes with double quotes, and then I’ve removed all references to that paper and then put them in again, and that seemed to fix it. Very odd. Thank you very much for pointing this out!!! Perhaps I should have less trust in Endnote . . .
Reviewer: Harry Sumnall

Dear dr. Sumnall,

Thank you for your comment. I am glad that you agree with us that your previous comments (and those of the other reviewers) have contributed to a stronger manuscript. Thank you for having taken the time to read the paper and provide these comments!

Kind regards, on behalf of all authors,

Gjalt-Jorn Peters

I have read the authors' resubmission and it is clear that they have undertaken a lot of work to revise the MS in light of my, and the other reviewers' comments. I accept the authors' responses to my original comments and have no further points to make.