

Reviewer's report

Title: A survey of energy drink consumption patterns among college students

Version: 3 **Date:** 28 May 2007

Reviewer: Zumin Shi

Reviewer's report:

General

This study conveys important information on energy drink consumption patterns among college students, which may have public health significance. A high percentage of college students consumed energy drinks 1-4 times a month. Energy drink consumption in six situations (i.e. insufficient sleep, need energy, studying or working on major project, driving car for long period of time, mix with alcohol while partying) may have adverse effects on health. The high percentage of self-reported side effects of energy drink in the research needs further study.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Methods: Time period (last year, or last month, or what?) of the use of energy drink should also be stated.
2. Results: It is confusing how many students actually participated in the study. The first sentence in the results section says the number is 253. But according to the tables, this figure is indicated to be number of the energy drink users (Table 1) and the second sentence in the results section states that 51% of those who participated were energy users. What is the response rate of the study?
3. Two different types of frequency of energy drink consumption are shown in the results. It will be helpful to have information on the association between the frequency of use of energy drink and side effects (one more table).
4. It is necessary to have a table presenting some important characteristics of the sample before the cross tables are presented.
5. Discuss differences between genders and possible implications, neither is it mentioned in the conclusions.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Abstract: The percentage of the symptoms should not be presented in the conclusion, but it could be concluded that these symptoms are fairly common.
2. Tables could be merged, at least table 2 and table 3.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.