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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

In response to your email dated 18th December 2019 regarding our manuscript entitled “Impact of bottle size on in-home consumption of wine: feasibility and acceptability randomised cross-over study”, please find our responses to your comments below:

There are a number of minor amendments to make before this manuscript can be accepted for publication to aid readability and clarity and give more detail. These should not take too long to do.

1. Please ensure the text reads as full sentences throughout and particularly on pages 6, 12, 13.
We thank the Editor for this comment. We have ensured that the text reads as full sentences throughout the manuscript.

2. Page 7 how were the households recruited by the agency? What method was used?
In response to this question we have now added the following information to the manuscript:

A recruiter employed by the researcher agency approached individuals outside large retail stores in the target areas and assessed interest in the study and eligibility. The contact details of individuals belonging to eligible households interested in taking part in the study were passed onto the research team. (Page 7, lines 10-13).

3. Page 8 did the agency also conduct other elements of the study?
Apart from the recruitment, the research agency did not conduct any other parts of the study. We have now added this information to the manuscript (page 7, lines 13-14)

4. Page 8, 10. More detail is required as to who did what eg. Who organised the wine deliveries? Who carried out the randomisation? Who consented and visited the households? Who debriefed the households etc.

Apart from the randomisation, which was performed by the first author of the manuscript (relevant information has now added to the manuscript on page 8, lines 18-19), all elements of the study were conducted by a trained research assistant. We have now clarified this in the manuscript by adding the following information:

All wine deliveries were organised and completed by a trained research assistant (CG….The researcher conducting the study, who was authorised by the Designated Premise Supervisor to sell alcohol on behalf of the leisure centre, picked up the wine, delivered it to participating households and accepted payments for the wine consumed (page 8, lines 15-18)

During a recruitment visit with household representatives (i.e. individuals who were recruited from each household to provide the necessary data), conducted by the trained researcher… (page 9, line 2)

5. Page 12 how were the feasibility outcomes measured - please provide more detail. More detail has now been added on page 13, lines 7-16:

- Recruitment rates assessed by calculating the proportion of households entering the study from households identified as eligible
- Number of households discontinuing participation at follow-ups
- Practical problems associated with:
  - delivering the intervention e.g. problems arranging delivery visits to ensure each intervention period was of equal duration
  - assessment procedures
  - collection of consumption-related data e.g. problems related to participants adhering to instructions to keep all wine bottles whether full, partially full or empty

Encountered problems were noted in a document on a case by case basis

6. Page 14 please give units measurement where appropriate for outcomes added

The unit of measurement (millilitres) has now been added to the outcomes.

7. Page 15 Please expand as to what the framework method is a little more. The following information has now been added:

The Framework method is an increasingly popular approach in medical and health research. It involves a systematic and flexible approach to organising and analysing qualitative data and a method of addressing specific research questions [30]. Its defining feature is the matrix output: rows representing cases, columns representing emerging concepts (termed ‘codes’). This allows the researcher to analyse the data in order both by case and by code [31]. It also allows in depth exploration of the data while simultaneously maintaining an effective and transparent audit trail, which reinforces the rigour of the analytical processes and the credibility of the findings [31]. (page 16, lines 2-9)
8. Page 19 the SD seems very large at 1235.4ml - I presume this is correctly calculated for a crossover trial with paired data?
Yes, we can confirm that the SD is correct and has been calculated appropriately.

9. Please make clear in the abstract what the 8.4ml and 1235.4 values are.
We have added the following information to the abstract to clarify the figures:

8.4ml (sd=1235.4); 95%CI -596.9, 613.8 (750ml bottles: 3385.2ml (sd=1698.5); 375ml bottles: 3376.7ml (sd=1719.0ml)).

10. Page 23 is a variance and effect size based on this small sample reliable for using to plan a main trial? A comment or cautionary caveat would be helpful in the discussion.
We thank the Editor for raising this point. We have added a relevant caveat to the Discussion:

… although caution is required regarding the precision of the estimate, given the small sample of the current study. (page 24, lines 20-21)

11. The flowchart numbers dont seem to add up totally for 3rd and 4th boxes - not all totals are accounted for.
We thank the Editor for spotting this. The figures have now been corrected.

12. Figure 2 - a legend for blue and red lines should be given. Shouldn't one line (blue) be in the opposite direction to the other?
We thank the Editor for this comment and the opportunity to clarify. A legend wasn’t included as the lines have been labelled within the figure (blue line: 750ml in Period 1 and 375 in Period 2; red line: 375ml in Period 1 and 750ml in Period 2). Nonetheless, to avoid any confusion, we have now also included a legend.

The lines suggest an order effect (i.e. more wine consumed with the 750ml bottles when the 375ml bottles are presented first and vice versa). They are also consistent with an increase in consumption over time with both bottle sizes, resulting in the parallel lines plot. As the editor correctly implies, it is only when these effects are not present that we would gain the classic crossed-lines plot.

We hope the above information and the changes made to the manuscript (highlighted in green) is sufficient to address your comments. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require further details.

Yours Faithfully,

Dr Eleni Mantzari (on behalf of all authors)