

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

Panagiotis Spanakis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Crete

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper has the potential to be a useful contribution to the literature but some additional work is needed. I do not consider the paper ready for wider dissemination, before the following issues are addressed.

The paper provides useful descriptive information on the prevalence of motives for pre-drinking across countries. The results could be used to identify the most important reasons why students engage in this risky behaviour. The authors conceived an interesting idea and should the limitations below be addressed the paper can become a quite enjoyable and useful reading.

Points to address:

1. To me the main focus of the paper is on self-reported motives (reasons why), which is different to “sociocultural determinants”. So I find this claim a bit misleading.
2. The COVID-19 restrictions may have affected pre-drinking behaviours in a way that the behaviours reported in this study are not typical of the participants. During the restrictions some students may have returned home and hence left the student-related drinking culture environment. Going out for drinks or gatherings at homes may have been prohibited or restricted. It is crucial to explain why/how you believe your results are still valuable, despite this consideration.
3. More details are needed in the Methods. It would be good to give some examples of the question asked or - even better - you could provide the questionnaire in an appendix. You should also explain the inclusion/exclusion criteria for your study.
4. More details are needed in the Results.
  1. Why did you exclude people older than 30?
  2. When reporting the results of comparisons, you should report all the relevant statistics and not just the p values. The additional statistics should be added in the places where they are missing.
  3. You report multiple comparisons between countries. Multiple comparisons increase chances of Type I error and should be performed only after demonstrating a significant main effect of country on each motive overall.
  4. You report weighted averages. You should explain how the weights were derived.
  5. When reporting between-age differences in DG situations, you refer to a t-test. Unless I misunderstood what you

meant, a t-test is used to compare means and not frequencies.

5. Given the heavy focus on culture, I would expect some cultural explanations developed in the discussion for the differences observed among countries. I would suggest that you either add these explanations or you tone down the “cultural” aspect of your findings.