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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study with a detailed study protocol.

The hypothesis of the study is a simple and common sense one - smaller bottles are likely to reduce overall consumption - regardless of what the product is.

The authors state that this has been studied in many and varied products but not alcohol.

The protocol is detailed and substantiation robust.

The authors pointed out that the current 750mls is widely seen as the standard size across British households.

However in terms of actual behavioural modification, bottle size is only a tiny part of the multifaceted decision on purchasing habits of British households. Issues like marketing, pricing, government support etc were not mentioned. These would have substantative effect on the impact of any intervention to modify behaviour.

It is not mentioned why 375mls is used instead of 500mls? If there is already an increase in 500mls bottles in the UK why weren't these studied? How about 375mls vs 500mls vs 750mls? A statement that 'the impact of 500ml bottles should be examined in future research' is insufficient.

There are far too many long sentences. This makes interpretation confusing and difficult.

e.g.s. Constituting two-thirds of the standard wine bottle size, this size could potentially overcome any possible perceptions of insufficient amounts associated with the 375ml bottles, thus rendering it more effective for decreasing wine consumption.

Indeed, visual exposure to larger portion sizes may adjust perceptions of what constitutes a 'normal' sized portion, especially given judgements of appropriate portion sizes can be hard for liquids and products made up of multiple units.

Very clumsily worded sentence.

Although the effect size of the intervention on consumption was unclear given observed order and/or period effects and an imbalance between groups, among other issues, using a meaningful difference approach and the variance of the intervention suggested by the current results allowed estimation of the required sample size for a future cross over randomised study.

That's a 55 word sentence!
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