## SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES

Outcome measures and Bayesian estimates of intervention versus control effects given by unadjusted regression models are presented in Table S1. As pointed out in the main text, these were not markedly different from the primary adjusted models. Table S2 presents outcome measures and Bayesian estimates of intervention Consent-1 and Consent-2 effects. As can be seen by the probability of effect estimates, there was no strong evidence of an effect in either direction. Likewise, when comparing Info-1 versus Info-2, there was no strong evidence of an effect in either direction (Table S3).

Table S1 - Primary and secondary outcome measures at 2- and 4-month follow-ups and effect estimates comparing the digital intervention and alcohol information groups - unadjusted models

|  |  | Unadjusted regression ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Complete case ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |
| Intervention | Control | Estimate ${ }^{\text {c }}$ (95\% CI) | Probability of effect | P-value |  |
| 2-month follow-up |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total weekly alcohol consumption, median (quartiles) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $7(3 ; 12)$ | $8(3 ; 15)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.89 \\ (0.80 ; 1.00) \end{gathered}$ | 97.9\% | 0.041 |  |
| Frequency of heavy episodic drinking, median (quartiles) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2(1 ; 5)$ | 3 (1;7) | $\begin{gathered} 0.80 \\ (0.71 ; 0.90) \end{gathered}$ | > 99.9\% | 0.0002 |  |
| Risky drinking, n (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 613 (79.3\%) | 634 (81.7\%) | $\begin{gathered} 0.86 \\ (0.67 ; 1.11) \end{gathered}$ | 88.0\% | 0.23 |  |
| 4-month follow-up |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total weekly alcohol consumption, median (quartiles) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $6(2 ; 12)$ | $8(4 ; 15)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.77 \\ (0.69 ; 0.86) \end{gathered}$ | > 99.9\% | < 0.0001 |  |
| Frequency of heavy episodic drinking, median (quartiles) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 (0;4) | 3 (1;6) | $\begin{gathered} 0.66 \\ (0.58 ; 0.75) \end{gathered}$ | > 99.9\% | < 0.0001 |  |
| Risky drinking, n (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 523 (75.6\%) | 619 (84.4\%) | $\begin{gathered} 0.58 \\ (0.45 ; 0.74) \end{gathered}$ | > 99.9\% | < 0.0001 |  |
| a Negative binomial regression for total weekly alcohol consumption; logistic regression for risky drinking. <br> ${ }^{\text {b }}$ 2-month complete-case: total weekly consumption $n=1557$, frequency of heavy episodic drinking $n=1548$, risky drinking $n=1548$. 4-month complete case: total weekly consumption $n=1429$, frequency of heavy episodic drinking $n=$ 1424 , risky drinking $n=1424$. <br> ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Marginal posterior incidence rate ratios (IRRs) for total weekly alcohol consumption and frequency of heavy episodic drinking; marginal posterior odds ratios (ORs) for risky drinking. |  |  |  |  |  |

Table S2 - Primary outcomes measured at 2- and 4-month follow-ups and effect estimates comparing Consent-1 and Consent-2 groups adjusted models

|  |  | Adjusted regression ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Complete case ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |
| Consent-1 | Consent-2 | Estimate ${ }^{\text {c }}$ (95\% CI) | Probability of effect | P-value |
| 2-month follow-up |  |  |  |  |
| Total weekly alcohol consumption, median (quartiles) |  |  |  |  |
| $8(3 ; 13)$ | $8(3 ; 14)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.96 \\ (0.87 ; 1.06) \end{gathered}$ | 78.6\% | 0.42 |
| Frequency of heavy episodic drinking, median (quartiles) |  |  |  |  |
| $2(1 ; 5)$ | $2(1 ; 5)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.99 \\ (0.89 ; 1.11) \end{gathered}$ | 55.5\% | 0.89 |
| 4-month follow-up |  |  |  |  |
| Total weekly alcohol consumption, median (quartiles) |  |  |  |  |
| 7 (3;13) | $8(3 ; 14)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.95 \\ (0.85 ; 1.06) \end{gathered}$ | 83.4\% | 0.33 |
| Frequency of heavy episodic drinking, median (quartiles) |  |  |  |  |
| $2(1 ; 5)$ | $2(1 ; 5)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.96 \\ (0.86 ; 1.08) \end{gathered}$ | 76.3\% | 0.47 |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Negative bino regression for ris civil status, age, <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ 2-month comp complete case: <br> c Marginal post drinking; margin | on for tota Regressio importanc <br> otal weekly consumpt <br> ce rate rati odds ratio | cohol consum djusted for wledge. <br> ion $n=1557$ 9 , frequency <br> r total week risky drinkin | and frequency values of the r <br> ncy of heavy e y episodic drin <br> ol consumption | pisodic d primary nking $\mathrm{n}=$ 424. uency of |

Table S3-Primary outcomes measured at 2- and 4-month follow-ups and effect estimates comparing Info-1 and Info-2 groups adjusted models

a Negative binomial regression for total weekly alcohol consumption and frequency of heavy episodic drinking; logistic regression for risky drinking. Regression models adjusted for baseline values of the respective primary outcome, sex, civil status, age, motivation, importance, and knowledge.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ 2-month complete-case: total weekly consumption $\mathrm{n}=781$, frequency of heavy episodic drinking $\mathrm{n}=775$. 4-month complete case: total weekly consumption $\mathrm{n}=736$, frequency of heavy episodic drinking $\mathrm{n}=732$.
${ }^{\text {c Marginal posterior incidence rate ratios (IRRs) for total weekly alcohol consumption and frequency of heavy episodic }}$ drinking; marginal posterior odds ratios (ORs) for risky drinking.

