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Reviewer's report:

Well written paper with a clear purpose. It needs to really focus on the problems associated with the tested warning.

The intro, discussion, limitations and conclusion need to include the following

1. The analyzed warning itself is problematic. "Zero alcohol during pregnancy." Does not warn the consumers about FASD. It simply instructs them to avoid warnings without providing a reason. It is also ambiguous. Further, the pictogram used is not graphic. A graphic warning, equivalent to one on a cigarette pack, will yield a stronger response. For example, an image of someone with FASD to depict the facial malformations associated with drinking during pregnancy. I suggest the authors visit Al-Hamdani, M. (2014). The case for stringent alcohol warning labels: Lessons from the tobacco control experience. Journal of Public Health Policy, 35(1), 65-74 and use this reference to explain how a stringent and clear warning such as "Drinking during pregnancy causes facial anomalies" along with an image to depict the consequence of drinking during pregnancy would have made a difference in how the participants perceived risks associated with beer and wine? Would they still think beer and wine are harmful? Visit Al-Hamdani and Smith (2015 and Wigg (2016) etc. to find the answer. Further, would 8.9% of the participants still think that beer is good for lactation if we showed them what alcohol really does? What I am trying to say here is because the warning is problematic as described above, using a less problematic warning would yield different results that are more reliable. You mention in your conclusion that "They (the warnings) should emphasize the risks associated with drinking during breastfeeding." You need to explain how? The authors are incorrect to say that knowledge about SDLs is effective to increase risk perceptions. In fact SDLs alone have been shown to be mostly ineffective and sometimes detrimental (in case of price-sensitive youth). It is the use of stringent warnings that will increase risk perceptions, regardless of the type of alcohol involved. Adding SDLs in conjunction with stringent warnings may be useful.

2. The very large sample size could have inflated significance. The authors need to comment on practical vs. statistical significance

Intro:
The authors need to justify at least some of the variables that they have used in their analyses. For instance, how/why would education be expected to result in differences in the outcomes measured.

Minor corrections

The term "multivariable" is misleading, it implies multivariate analysis which the authors did not do. They seem to have used binary logistic regression with multiple variables. They need to say that they tested multiple variables.
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