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Reviewer's report:

General

This is a very interesting paper that explores the association between socioeconomic status and alcohol use among 11 - 15 year olds in 28 countries. The paper is very well written and interesting. However, it is unclear what the importance is of the findings -- the 'so what' based on the results.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. page 7-8 -- the authors indicate that to take into account the clustering, the odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were based on "robust standard errors." It is unclear what "robust standard errors" means. Did the authors use a statistic package such as Stata or SUDAAN? If so, they should clarify that in the text. If not, they need to rerun their analysis with an appropriate statistical package.
2. page 8 -- family affluence for boys -- the list of countries should include Hungary and exclude Croatia.
3. page 8 -- the sentence that starts "However, in most of these countries.." doesn't make sense given the data presented in Table 2.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. page 4 -- the authors indicate that "little is know about the development of socio-economic differences." I don't think that SES differences 'develop.'
2. page 6 -- the authors indicate that Table 1 provides basic information about the study population, leading one to expect some demographic characteristics such as gender, age, etc. however, Table 1 provides affluence and occupation data.
3. SES was developed from 'where worked' and 'type of job'. It would be helpful if the authors describe how countries condensed those answers into a single scale.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests