

Response to Reviewer:-

Thank you for your constructive feedback on our article. We have attended to your comments in the following ways:

-We clarified the design of the study by adding that it was an experiment with random assignment. The number of students assigned to each of the conditions is now reported in the procedure section on page 8 of the manuscript. They were evenly divided.

-The beer and rubbing alcohol were only placed on the word find, so it was hidden as part of the procedure used. We clarified this on page 8 in the procedure. There were no demand characteristics. Participants were not told anything about the potential scent in the environment and were only told they would be completing questionnaires and a word find as the cover story. We revised the statement about perfume or other smells being a confound in the discussion. While we did not ask a manipulation check question, we did ask if they noticed anything suspicious in the debriefing and participants did not report anything suspicious. These clarification statements were added on pages 13-14 of the discussion.

The reliability and validity of the Domain-Specific Risk-Taking Scale was added on page 7.

The reliability and validity of the Sexual Risks Scale was added on page 8.

Figure 1 was converted to a line graph as recommended. Figure 2 was converted to a Table as recommended. These changes make the data presentation clearer – thank you for the suggestions.

We provided a couple of example questions from the Sexual Risks Scale on page 8. Participants did not report anything considered unethical and the measures were all reviewed by our IRB. The scale is a standardized measure which can be reviewed in its entirety with the reference provided. No additional questions outside the standard measure were asked about sexual partners or condom use. We have clarified this in the method.

We believe these changes have strengthened our manuscript and are thankful for the suggestions