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Re-review of manuscript: Teenage drinking, alcohol availability and pricing: a study of risk and protective factors for alcohol related harms in school children.
I do not think that the authors have answered thoroughly to some of my earlier comments. Therefore, I still think that the manuscript should be revised in the following manners.

Major compulsory revisions:
• I still think the rationale and aim for this study is weak. The authors included a small section presenting “why this study is important” but there is still no section describing what is already known about this subject. I think, that variables included in the analyses should be introduced in the introduction.
• A rationale for choosing the variables included is lacking.
• In my opinion the description of some of the variables included is superficial. How are ‘drink in public places’, ‘drink related violence’ and LSOA measured and coded?
• Not knowing the response rates is a drawback of the study. This implies that selection bias needs to be discussed.

Minor essential revisions:
• The very beginning of the paper is very broad and generally the introduction does not guide the reader into this subject.
• There is not a consistent nomenclature of the variables, e.g. page 6: ‘lapses in memory’ which I suppose is the same as ‘forget things after drinking’ in the tables.
• I think that the discussion section would benefit from being ordered in a classical way. Starting the discussion with limitations seems strange to me.
• I acknowledge that the authors better put the results into perspective, but I think that there is too much description of the results in the discussion section.
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