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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting paper examining the feasibility and acceptability of a computerised tool to reduce alcohol and sweetened beverage use during pregnancy. The paper is likely to be of interest to the readers of BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. I have listed several areas that authors could consider to improve before resubmitting. Overall the paper has merit and is well written. Congratulations to the authors on conducting an important study.

**Major compulsory**

1. I would provide a more comprehensive literature review focusing particularly on other interventions in the area and clearly demonstrating the need and rationale for the present study.

2. The authors mention no active recruitment has occurred, could they please explain how then the participants were informed about the study and whether there was anyone they could discuss their participation in it (ethical concerns).

3. Could the authors provide more details for the intervention, i.e. was it designed on previous studies / recommendations? Is it evidence-based?

4. Limitations – I would mention this study was not controlled. Nothing wrong with it as this is a feasibility study but future studies should compare it to standard care through RCT designs.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

5. I would modify the title to feasibility and acceptability of… as currently the title suggests this will be a trial.

6. Could the authors please state the type of design (within participant trial?).

7. In few places there are some minor language problems / omissions (e.g. methods ‘whether they or not they’, ‘participants were recruited a Women’, some missing brackets, etc). Could the authors proof read the paper.

8. Results – I would not repeat the information presented in tables and thus this section can be reduced, e.g. descriptives could just be a couple of lines, similarly the section on feasibility is very repetitive of the table. In characteristics of women, could the authors add the % to 60 women.

9. Discussion – this is overall very well written. Some suggestion to main findings, some assistance may indeed boost the numbers. It has been shown in many psychotherapy studies that self-directed therapies when even minimally
assisted, are likely to be more effective and associated with better attrition.

10. Table 1 – could the authors add a column for sweetened beverages. I think it would be of interest.
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