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Reviewer's report:

I found the manuscript to be extremely interesting and timely. I have the following comments:

1. Major Compulsory Revisions
-- The background section seemed lacking. It may be there is a limited amount of space for the background, but if possible, more information is needed. For instance, in Background, paragraph 2, it would be beneficial to provide more data by population/race and to provide comparison data. Also, it would be helpful to have information on the impact of SSB during pregnancy since that is one of the major focuses of the manuscript.

-- Methods, second paragraph. It needs to be made clear that this is the actual study— the first paragraph focused on a pilot test, but there is no transition to the actual study in paragraph 2.

-- Methods-- please add details about consent or implied consent for study participants.

-- Results-- typically the n goes before the percentage (i.e., \( n = 237; 82\% \)) as opposed to how it is written currently (82%, \( n = 237 \)).

-- Limitations section-- I feel there is a lot missing from this. Here are a few suggestions of other limitations to add: participants were self-selected; limited generalizability of the study; no follow-up or referrals with women to gauge the impact of the program; increased educational level of participants may have led to biased results.

-- Figure 1: this seems a bit convoluted/busy-- is it possible to clean up this figure?

-- Tables-- prefer to have n first with percentage in paragraph after n (perhaps this journal requires the % first).

-- Table 1-- percentage given for WIC participants in 2nd column, but no n given.

-- Table 1-- significant findings reported in the prose but would also be helpful to indicate significant findings in the table.

2. Minor Essential Revision
-- Alcohol screening section in Methods, 2nd paragraph-- was unclear what "limited resources meant" and if that should be further described since it impacted study protocol.

-- Results, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence-- typo; "of" needs to be added before "users."

-- Results, first paragraph-- can you make a reference to Figure 1.

-- Results-- can you clarify if you asked if this was their first pregnancy; if they had other children?

-- Results, characteristics of womrn using alcohol during pregnancy, 1st sentence-- there is a ")" missing from the end of this sentence after "pregnant."

-- Results-- feasibility of computerized SBI program-- can you clarify in 2nd sentence that it took some participants 2 minutes to complete all modules? That doesn't seem like it would be correct.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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