

## Article title:- The Scent of Beer and Rubbing Alcohol on Behavioral Risk Intentions in College Students

### Reviewer's comment-1

1. The topic of this manuscript is likely to be of interest to a large audience. Some of the literature reviewed seems **dated**. It captures the gist of what was done in this study.
2. The writing is clear and easy to understand. It is well written.
3. The introduction and discussion sections seem fine to me. The **design** has a few issues. First, this appears to be an experiment, but it is unclear how many participants were assigned to each condition. Was the assignment randomly done? If this was an experiment, what was **the cover story?** I am placing the beer and rubbing alcohol in front of students **creates demand characteristics**. In the discussion the author(s) mentioned students might have smelled perfume, or other smells further confounding the results. These are serious confounds. There is no attempt to do a manipulation check, or a debriefing to check if students were suspicious and in fact found the manipulation effective. The descriptive measures come from different sources, these **need elaboration as to whether they are valid and reliable**—report those if reported in the literature ( ethical, financial, health/safety, recreational, social). Results seem appropriate to me and I'm glad the author(s) recognized the need to apply the **Tukey procedure** to protect against Type I errors in the analysis. For Figure 1 I recommend using a line graph so the interaction can be easily seen, if they go with the bars, the standard error should also be depicted on each bar. Figure 2 is best represented with a Table in my view, perhaps using different subscripts to assess significance for Example

Table 1

Beer R. Alcohol, Control ...

M SD M SD M SD

Risk 3.34<sub>a</sub> 1.00 3.20<sub>a</sub> 1.30 2.50<sub>b</sub> 1.09

The <sub>a</sub> and <sub>a</sub> show that the difference is with the control group only.

4. There is a vast literature on alcohol use and college students. But I believe the smell dimension is new, and it seems okay with me. More clarification is needed with operational definitions, which are not properly given. What was asked related to sexual partners? This can be intrusive and Ethical Boards would have problems. Participants were asked about the likeness (likelihood?) of purchasing condoms, but then in the same paragraph reference to “more likely to use condoms” ??? Which one is it? This needs more clarity, and it is a reason I have asked for validities and reliability reporting of existing /used dependent measures

5. I have no competing interest as a reviewer and are providing supportive feedback in the hope the author(s) can improve this manuscript.

**6. I hope the author(s) can address my concerns, regarding design, confounds, and ethical considerations regarding operational definitions of variables. Consider suggestions on the results, regarding standard error for bars (or turn it in a line graph), and the Table 1 instead of Figure 2.**