Reviewer’s report

**Title:** The effect of glass shape on alcohol consumption in a naturalistic setting: a feasibility study

**Version:** 2  
**Date:** 11 March 2015

**Reviewer:** Karen Kopciuk

**Reviewer’s report:**

Re-Review

1. Is the question posed original, important and well defined?

This manuscript reports on the results of a small feasibility study that examined the impact of glass shape on alcohol consumption in three public houses in the United Kingdom (UK). The study purpose was to extend results obtained from a controlled experiment to a naturalistic setting, with the expectation of planning a larger, randomized control study in the future. The use of a choice architecture intervention (e.g., glass shape) to modify alcohol consumption is an interesting approach for policy interventions. The authors were able to show this type of study is feasible but also clearly described the challenges they encountered and possible mitigation strategies.

2. Are the data sound and well controlled?

Data and results are extremely limited as this was a feasibility study. Surrogate measures of consumption (monetary takings over fixed time intervals) were used to evaluate the impact of changing the glassware on total consumption for the three pubs combined, as the owner did not want to disclose financial details on usual takings. A small pilot study was undertaken at another industry partner to correlate monetary takings with units of alcohol sold. In future studies, investigators plan to work with establishments that can track these specific types of beverages using modern tills that easily record this information. This could be pilot-tested before a full roll-out of a randomized trial, to ensure measurement accuracy of the key study outcome.

3. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the data?

The feasibility aspects of the study are well described in the Results and Discussion section, with challenges and limitations carefully noted as well. The summary paragraph in this section outlined what worked well and what did not, with details subsequently provided.

4. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to allow others to evaluate and/or replicate the work?

The investigators conducted a feasibility study in three small pubs where they switched out the usual glassware for straight (curved) glassware in the first week in Pub #3 (Pubs 1,2) and then the other form of glassware curved (straight)
glassware in the second week in these pubs. A second study that involved free advertising for the pubs took place a month following this feasibility study, so did not confound results but did contribute to the participation by the pub landlords.

5. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods?
As this was a feasibility study, some planned approaches worked well while others did not. The investigators appear to have identified critical components of this intervention study that will be important considerations in a future, randomized trial.

6. Can the writing, organization, tables and figures be improved?
The revised manuscript has improved organization and flow, and the timing and purpose of a second study has been more clearly described. The lone figure and table are sufficient for this type of study.

7. When revisions are requested.
No further revisions requested.
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