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Reviewer's report:

The objective of the study is "to describe the social context of pregnant-involved young Aboriginal women, who uses substances and to explore whether or not an Indigenous-Specific Determinants of Health Model can predict substance use among this population". The objective is important but quite ambitious. Since the total sample consists of 3 different populations it makes the analyses that are complicated in themselves even more complicated. Even if the methods are well described, I really don’t know what comes out of all the analyses, except that the conclusion is that the ILCDS Model is not fully supported.

Perhaps it would be better in the first round just to give good descriptions of the 3 different populations, explore what they have in common, and try to highlight in what areas they need more specific help?

I also question how the dependent substance use variables are defined into heavy/light use, especially that light drug use was defined as using less than daily.

Throughout the paper there is an in-consequent use of marking sub-headings in italics and underlining.

The English should be worked on - especially when using terms as: pregnant-involved, survival sex, accessing a social worker, counselor etc.

In the paper 6 tables and 1 figure are included, which are too many tables, and sometimes also are difficult to read.

All references are not written identical in the paper, and it is problematic to present references with no authors, just "Anonymous".

I also question the length of the paper and think it would profit from being shorter.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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