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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript presents an interesting study and is generally well-designed. However I have a number of queries that should be addressed in a revision.

1. It is not currently clear from the abstract that the primary outcomes were measured using observation and the secondary outcomes using questionnaires.

2. The authors suggest that sip duration is used as a proxy for sip size. I don't think that this is valid. Sips of the same duration could reflect 'gulps' of a large volume of liquid or a slow sip of a small volume of liquid. References to sip size should therefore be replaced with sip duration. A more valid measure of sip size might be to calculate the average volume consumed in each sip based on number of sips taken and the volume of wine in the glass.

3. I'm not convinced that perceived intoxication is a good proxy for the amount of wine that they believed they had consumed. There is likely to be wide variation in perceived intoxication based not only on expectation due to amount consumed, but also due to speed of consumption, alcohol drinking history and factors such as recent consumption of food.

4. Although I am not reviewing the results and discussion I would urge caution when considering and discussing whether or not participants consumed the wine at their own usual pace. The unusual setting and the knowledge that someone was waiting for them to finish is likely to have resulted in faster consumption than might occur in more naturalistic settings.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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