

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

Gabriele B. Beckhoff¹

¹ University of Southern Denmark

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments on the article:

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

To the author

-

The article is written quite unsystematic, a lot of important information is missing and on the other hand a tremendous number of tables that are poorly described. This structure makes it nearly impossible to understand the main message of the article. However, the idea to explain determinants for pre-drinking is important. However due to the tremendous amount of missing methodical information and wrong interpretation due to missing information in the method part, the authors should work with the article again. This work undermines the good idea of Qeios as the mistakes in the article are still there and readers should not use the results as they are presented wrong and lead to wrong conclusion.

Title:

When presenting results from a cross sectional survey the authors can only present associations and not effects. The word "influence" in the title is wrong depending to the study design you cannot say if pre-drinking influences motivation (By the way; this sounds also crazy). In the context of the given study design, the authors can only talk about associations.

Introduction:

The introduction is acceptable; however, it is very repetitive. It would be helpful to reduce the number of words by organizing the introduction.

Method:

My biggest concern is connected to the method section. No information about the design (I believe it is a cross sectional design) is available. No information is given how participant were contacted, no information about response rate of participants (I expect it is very low), no information about the power in the analysis or the sample size calculations is available (also here I expect that the number of 6 to 8 participants in four of the considered countries is far away of

allowing a trustful analysis). Really crazy is presenting a weighted average without explaining the underlying populations. For which population weighted averages are calculated? Were different population used for eg. Singapore and UK, Russia, and USA? Is it necessary to calculate weighted averages when having 6 people in one country?

Finally, also the explanation of drinking motives as sociocultural determinants is highly questionable. Do the authors really believe, having fun when drinking alcohol is a sociocultural determinant. The authors should find better words in expressing their drinking motives.

Result presentation:

I do not like to count the number of estimations the authors present; however, I believe the authors present more estimates than they have observations. This is impossible and might lead to misinterpretations.

Conclusion:

Finally, the conclusion is simply wrong. I only like to choose one sentence and explain why it is wrong: “one of the main conclusions is that participation in PD and DGs involve a high proportion of students.” (page 13 first/second line of conclusion). This cannot be concluded. They do not provide information how the data were collected, they do not have any information about participation rate and they exclude all students not drinking alcohol. With all these limitations no conclusion about the prevalence of drinking habits in students is allowed.