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Author’s response to reviews:

1. The title doesn’t really reflect what was done in this study. I understand that the broader goal is to eventually explore the long-term effects of alcohol restriction, but long-term effects are not measured in this study.

Response: We amended the title; “long-term” is now removed. The revised title is an accurate reflection of the aims of the feasibility study and the larger trial that we are planning.

2. In the abstract, results please indicate how many women were randomized to each group.

Response: This information has been added to the abstract.

3. In the abstract, report the recruitment rate: number who agreed to take part over number who responded to advertisements.

Response: This information has been added to the abstract.

4. Why was this study conducted in women of that age? Please mention in the abstract that this study was conducted in a heavy drinker from a low drinking demographic.

Response: The choice of target population was explained in the Introduction (page 6). In the abstract we explain that we recruited women who drank in excess of 28 units per week. We did not target women from a ‘low drinking demographic’ so we do not understand why the reviewer wants us to add this information to the abstract.

We have now had three rounds of peer review, with different reviewers and editors each time. Each reviewer / editor has requested additional information in the abstract which has made it very difficult to
stick to the 350-word limit. We have made additional edits to the abstract to comply with the word limit.

5. This sentence is repeated in the manuscript: “Note that we did not attempt to follow-up the final seven participants who completed the intervention period and attended the post-intervention visit in mid- to late-June because those follow-up sessions would have fallen outside of the funding period (funding expired at the end of June 2018).” First on lines 26-33, page 11 and then on line 49-lines 7 on pages 14-15. Delete one instance.

Response: We deleted the first instance on page 11.

6. In table 3 report medians with a measure of spread.

Response: We now report the interquartile ranges alongside the medians.