

Review of: "Which sociocultural determinants of pre-drinking amongst undergraduate university students influence motivation"

Elitsa Dimitrova

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper explores the determinants of predrinking and participation in drinking games in three countries selected from an international sample. It focuses on situations/contexts and motives for participation of students from universities in Singapore, the UK and mainland Europe. The data are collected through anonymous online questionnaire disseminated through university student networks.

My suggestions to the authors are the following:

1. Normalization theory and the manner in which it is used in the study should be explained in more detail.
2. Global variance in sociocultural determinants of alcohol consumption is mentioned but it is not clear what differences were identified in the literature.
3. In the 'Methods section' the description of the main questions used in the analysis should be expanded in more details, i.e. how predrinking is measured (questions and response options), what motives were included in the questionnaire, other variables used in the analysis, etc.
4. It should be mentioned that the small sample size in certain countries may affect the significance tests presented in **Table 5**. Non-parametric test analysis; inter-group differences - motives for drinking game playing.
5. The differences in the responses of students in the selected countries should be described in more detail.
6. It should be mentioned that the share of women in the sample is 80%. Among women alcohol consumption and alcohol misuse tends to be lower. This may explain the similarities between the studied countries in the prevailing motives of PD and DGs.
7. Generalization of the results should be avoided. For example, the authors claim that the findings corroborate that "PD by university students is normalised behaviour, with heavy episodic drinking involved" but the small sample size, sociodemographics of the respondents and the specifics of the sampling procedure do not allow for generalization of the results. The results are valid only for the studied group of respondents.
8. The authors claim that certain motives are universally accepted in the sampled countries but this could be due to the specifics of the sample (small sample size, sociodemographics of the respondents (prevailing female), monolingual

questionnaire used in the participating countries, etc.). This limits the analysis of the cultural differences in PD and DG in the studied countries and the conclusion of PD and DG as a normalised behaviour should be followed also by a note on the limitations of the study.

9. The authors claim that the analysis focuses on sociocultural determinants in the selected countries. They should summarize what differences/ similarities between the studied countries have been uncovered in the empirical analysis.

10. The identified determinants of PD and DG should be clearly described and commented in the context of the existing studies.