

<i>Reviewer Comment</i>	<i>Line(s)</i>
Introduction	
A definition of binge drinking and excessive drinking should be provided to reinforce the hazardous nature.	32
In this line the authors switch to the term “heavy-drinking.” In order to remain consistent, I encourage the authors to use the same terminology throughout the paper. For example, use “excessive drinking.”	35
Motivational Enhancement Therapy and the Drinker’s Check-Up should have reference if it is a published instrument.	46
It is not recommended to use such a large quote within a manuscript. I suggest you revise this reference and paraphrase with proper citation.	Lines 68-76
I believe the word you are looking for in this sentence is “ensure” and not “insure”.	Line 98
There is no purpose statement in the introduction. I recommend writing a purpose statement to make the reason for this research clearer to the reader.	
Materials & Methods	
What software was used? This should be included and correctly cited within text and in the reference page.	
Why were the alcohol consumption inclusion criteria needed?	117-120
Based on the first sentence (lines 110-112) the authors needed 90 participants in order to ensure efficacious results. However, the authors only obtained 88 participants. I am not sure how these results could contribute to literature if the authors did not collect the	123

minimum number of participants they indicated were needed. I suggest revising lines 110-112. It seems like 90 participants is somewhat arbitrary because in a study of this scope with an administered intervention, the 88 should suffice.	
Standard deviations should be abbreviated in all capital letters such that it reflects <i>SD</i> and not <i>sd</i> as it is currently written in the manuscript.	
This is a longitudinal study and should be specified.	
How was autonomy of personally private and sensitive information maintained?	
Results	
Are the average consumption results consistent with existing literature?	255-259
Discussion	
This section seems more like a limitations section. Furthermore, the authors pose questions in this section which is an interesting and nontraditional approach. However, it does not lend itself toward quality. I recommend reorganizing to fit into the limitations.	410-422
The authors draw a causal inference by using the term “apparently.” Authors should explain in further detail, why females have stronger protective behavioral strategies? Is there existing evidence that shows this to be true?	437
What is a “sham intervention?” And why would it benefit future studies?	449
What are some examples of varying cultural contexts that could have led to the results in this study?	454-455

Why is asking for recall problematic? This should be explained further.	448-450
Overall	
There is an excessive use of additional words that do not need to be included. The writing could be tapered, providing more concise sentences and clearer writing. For example, in line 37-38 the authors write the following sentence: “Clearly, therefore, interventions are needed to tackle the problem 37 of university-students’ drinking.” Removing “clearly” would streamline the writing and contribute to an improved word count. However, this is a problem throughout the entire manuscript and I highly recommend revision.	
I noticed many misspelled words throughout the manuscript. Authors should revise to correct spelling mistakes.	
The authors use a lot of first person, which is generally not encouraged. Authors should consider rewriting in third person to make the manuscript more robust.	
The writing goes back and forth between past and present tense. I encourage the authors to revise so that the manuscript is in only one tense.	
For some reason, particularly in the latter half of the manuscript, the authors pose a lot of questions to the readers. This detracts from the robust nature of the study. Authors would benefit from refraining from asking questions and writing their work in the form of statements.	