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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor
Thank you for letting us revise the manuscript again. We have considered the reviewers comments and made changes according to their suggestions. We have added one more author and changed the title. Below we report point to point our responses to the reviewers. All changes are tracked. We hope that the manuscript will be suitable for publishing now.

Best regards
Håkan Källmén

Reviewer 1.
1. The reviewer is still concerned about the heterogeneity in the age group 17-71 years in the control group and thinks we need to elaborate more on this. While our sample size in the control group did not permit us to make the CFA on each strata, we chose to report Principal components stratified on tree age groups in this sample. This is discussed in the limitations.
2. correct... we removed the term "younger population" in the conclusion
3. the mean scores on AUDIT for the population sample is now presented in Table 3 to make comparisons possible between the samples
4a. AUDIT-C is only included in Table 3 and serves a mere description of the level of Consumption
4b. "tabe" was changed to "Table"
5. The reference O'connell et al was reformatted
6. The manuscript was proof read for grammatical errors by a English speaking person and the listed errors corrected
7. Audit items are listed in table 2.

REVIEWER 2
1. yes
2. We chose to omit the term "elderly" in the paragraph the reviewer refers to. Further see point 1 reviewer 1 (LNF) regarding age stratification.

3. Of course, our aim was NOT to compare the scores on AUDIT and AUDIT-C. The aim was rewritten for clarification and what we meant was that the presented scores on AUDIT and AUDIT-C serves as norm data for future studies.

4. It's true that a larger proportion on non-consumers reduces the psychometric properties of the test and now this is pointed out in the discussion.

5-8 ok

9. Audit items are listed in table 2.

10. We proofread the manuscript and we believe we got them all

11-14. ok

15. This limit is indeed arbitrary but serves a purpose for pedagogical reasons. We tried to justify the limit by adding a reference in the result section.

16. A possible selection bias in the sampling of the elderly is a potential limitation and is now noted as one in the discussion

17. ok

18. ok

19. See our response to point 9 (SB) and to point 7 (Reviewer 1 LNF)