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**Reviewer's report:**

**MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS:**

1. What are the (a) objectives and (b) hypothesis of this paper?
2. The Method section is too long and too detailed about data collection of the whole survey. I suggest this section should be divided into 2 sections: data collection and statistical methods.

The data collection method can be much shorter. The authors should make it more concise but informative. If the readers are interested to see more details of data collection method, they can read from the survey report.

It was mentioned that the data for this study is from the mixed method study, using both questionnaire and semi-structure interviews. However, I think only the data from the questionnaires were used for the analysis. If I understand correctly, it should be mentioned clearly.

It would be very helpful if the authors would provide the definitions of each variable used in this report and explain how each variable was measured. As of now, it’s still not clear, for example, how ‘short term alcohol risk’ is defined and how to measure that who are the low risk, risky and high risk.

3. Explanations about statistics used are not quite understandable. For example, the explanation for using chi-square test and the reason for selecting only variables with a p-value <0.25 at the univariate level to include in the logistic regression models. Also, what was the purpose of using those models?

4. In the Results section, it was mentioned only that that table 1 and 5 highlights the demographic characteristics of the sample and the result of multivariate analysis, respectively. My questions are what are those highlights? They should be pointed out.

5. I don’t know why some tables were read in the Discussion section. I think this section should discuss the results and compare them with the theories or findings of other research work.

**MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS:**

1. Please make sure that the % mentioned in the text is the same as in the table. One example is in paragraph 2 of the Results section which stated that 53.1% not undertaking sufficient physical activity, while it is 46.9% in the table.
6. I don’t know why some tables were read in the Discussion section. I think this section should discuss the results and compare them with the theories or findings of other research work.
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