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Reviewer's report:

The present manuscript is a descriptive survey study of young women attending a reproductive health care clinic for routine medical exams. It describes their sexual risk behaviors, STI diagnoses, substance use, and depressive symptoms, and then assesses for differences in these based on race/ethnicity. The manuscript is well-written and clear. Although the findings are not particularly novel, they do support previous results and may be somewhat useful for informing intervention practices. I hope the authors find the below critiques useful when crafting their revision for this or another outlet.

Abstract - page 2, line 30. Please clarify the difference between "White only" and "non-Hispanic White". Please also clarify this in the results section and describe how the "White only" women were coded for analyses. Are they in the non-Hispanic White group or something else? In lines 41-44, make clear whether these differences were statistically significant. The conclusions in lines 45-47 could briefly address racial/ethnic differences in the findings.

Introduction - page 4, lines 88-90 are awkwardly worded. Please rephrase. On page 5, it would strengthen the manuscript to present research on racial/ethnic differences in substance use and depression, particularly as these are cited later as reasons for the hypotheses. In the paragraph beginning on line 107, it would be useful to also include depressive symptoms here and in the next paragraph starting on line 116. I also suggest referring to this throughout as depressive symptoms rather than depression given that no formal diagnosis is made.

Method - page 7, line 155 - how were 1 and 2 labelled on the condom use scale? On page 8, I found the description of the peak daily alcohol use dichotomization confusing. Was this divided into 2 drinking variables (binge and high intensity) and then dichotomized yes/no for each of those? Please clarify.

Results - page 10, line 207 - were women who did not fit either of the 3 racial/ethnic groups left out of all analyses? Line 223 - how were women coded who did not have any sex partners in the past 3 months? Lines 239-241 - the numbers in the text do not match the table.

Conclusions - line 297 - number presented does not match the results. One larger point - although interest in information was lowest for substance use, all of the categories were pretty low across the groups, with most right at the midpoint of the scale or lower. I think this should be addressed in the conclusions, with some possible suggestions for how providers should present such information to their patients when needed given the relatively low interest levels.
Additionally, do findings suggest the need for universal screening of any of the conditions/behaviors explored here?

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

No

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

Yes

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

Yes

**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:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.