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Reviewer's report:

1. None

2.

(a) Page 6. Is this really the counterfactual? As it stands it relates only to alcohol consumption undertaken in 2006. But many of the costs (particularly health costs) are results of both past and present smoking. Surely the counterfactual should be "What costs would have been avoided in Thailand in 2006 if there had been no past or present alcohol consumption in Thai society".

(b) Page 6. The paper needs an explanation of why the authors believe that the benefits of alcohol consumption should not be costed (benefits being negative costs).

(c) Page 6. Note that it is perfectly possible for drinkers themselves to bear external costs (for an explanation of this see Collins and Lapsley, 2008, National Drug Strategy Monograph Series No. 64, page 8).

(d) Page 9. The derivation of crime AAFs is not adequately explained. It is simply referred to as a "macro costing technique". Thus it is difficult to assess the validity of these AAFs. It is very easy to overestimate alcohol-attributable crime AAFs, using association rather than causality, but it is not clear from the text whether this is a problem here.

(e) Table 4 and references. There is a more recent Australian alcohol cost study (see Collins and Lapsley, 2008, referred to above).

3.

Page 12. "presenteeism" is a term which, while perfectly correct, is not widely in use in the literature. It would be useful to define it here, in terms of reduced on-the-job productivity.

In relation to the quality of written English, the quality is adequate with some minor problems. For example:

In the Abstract the word "evidences" is used. As far as I am aware this word can only be used in the singular.

The article uses the word "data" as though it is singular. It is in fact plural.

These are minor issues and below I judge the quality to be acceptable.
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