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Reviewer’s report:

This is an extremely well written paper on the delivery of a novel intervention in a setting that has the potential to reach large numbers of adults drinking above weekly guidelines. The methods are robust and the authors explore the limitations they experienced. My comments below are minor, mainly requesting further clarification.

Discretionary Revisions

Background

The background would benefit from costs to the UK workplace in addition to US, as this is where the study is based.

Methods

I’d be interested to know if some workplaces had alcohol policies in place. For example, zero alcohol in the workplace may mean that some employees are reluctant to undertake screening.

Line 12 p6: could you add a reference to support statement “not reported here”?

Line 1 p7: is the prevalence in UK or regional?

Line 14 p7: assessment was conducted in private rooms by who? Nurses?

Line 19 p7: how many workplaces did provide age criteria?

Line 15 p10: was feedback provided immediately after assessment?

Results

Line 14-16 p11: needs re-wording slightly.

Discussion

Line 2 p14: other references for low recruitment to online health check in workplaces in UK include:


Confidence in confidentiality of responses to screening was 60% in feasibility study above.

Line 9 p14: This is the first mention of a workplace health event, would like to see this mentioned in methods.

I would like to see a paragraph/sentence on how you would intend to implement this intervention. E.g. an annual health event in each company? I’d also be interested in cost effectiveness and qual research with employees to determine barriers to accessing the tool – but appreciate this is beyond the remit of this particular study.

Conclusions
Line 5-9 p18: I would delete these 2 sentences and the sentence on line 14 re. there being some evidence for holistic programmes as these are not direct conclusions of this study.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance 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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