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Reviewer's Report

Title: Alcohol consumers' attention to warning labels and brand information on alcohol packaging: Findings from cross-sectional and experimental studies

Comments to Authors:

The authors report findings of an exploratory cross-sectional and experimental study which measured the extent to which alcohol consumers pay attention to warning labels on alcohol packaging, and how increased attention to these labels affects their motivation to change drinking practices. The study's findings are interesting, and the design is commendable.

General Comments:

1. The labels your participants were exposed to appeared to be mostly wine and soda. Did you assess whether or not the participants already knew the brands and these labels? This may have affected the outcome of this experiment.

2. Brand preference may also affect their motivation to pay (or not pay) attention to labels. Did you consider this?

3. If you measured only wine, then 'alcohol' may not be appropriate in your title.

Major Revision:

1. Your background is narrow because it lacked relevant citations. You need to broaden your literature on alcohol warning labels, responsible drinking message/labels and the politics behind these concepts.

2. In as much as it depends on what the editor decides, I think that your discussion of study 1 (without doing the same with study 2) before a general discussion is repetitive. You need to merge the two, especially because you repeated what has been said earlier in study 1.
Minor revision:

Page 4- You omitted heading: 'Background'

Page 4, lines 62-63- warning labels have limited… (see Stockwell, 2006, for an overview). This reference is neither numbered nor cited according to the BMC Public Health's guideline.

Page 4, reference number 2 is missing.

Page 6, line 109 reads: Most warning labels… Why "most" and not all? What is the reason for selecting the labels with(out) features that are in compliance with UK's specification? This requires more details.

Discussion: (study 1)

Page 10, lines 219-222- Some recent research suggests that…[15]. You cited only one source. Cite more recent studies with international outlook. For example:

Simone Pettigrew et.at (2016). Reverse engineering a 'responsible drinking' campaign to assess strategic intent.


Stautz et al.'s paper, which is conspicuously missing in your manuscript, should not, especially because of its methodology.

Study 2:

Page 12, line 259… "We used the same stimuli and questionnaire…” Then why separating the discussion?

Page 12, line 268- Elliott & Ainsworth, 2012 is not cited properly.

General Discussion

Page 16, line 377-8- A possible explanation is….due to current design. Although this may be true, you need to support your assertion by citing relevant sources.

Page 17, lines 383-385- this is a repetition of your previous discussion. I would suggest that you merge the discussion sections.
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