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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions.
None.
This is a great paper on a topic useful to public health.

Minor Essential Revisions:

P. 4 Remove the word 'nowadays'.
Also the term "health related food and beverage marketing campaigns", could consider calling them "nutrition related" instead.

P.4 Say "the unique approach of the research reported in this paper" -sounds better.

P. 7. Second para - Would be better to say "Assessment of successful examples was gathered from twelve food market experts (see Table 1) though interviews or email consultation.(otherwise there is not introduction to table 1 in the text).

P.8. Second paragraph - second sentence would be better if it read "Selection criteria included: availability of information from at least two sources; and the need for achieving a distribution of cases ...target groups (age); product categories, company sizes and ..."

P.9 Middle paragraph "All interviews followed a semi-structured interview guide (SEE TABLE 2) and the interviews...".

Final paragraph p. 9 suggest introducing this with "The data analysis is depicted in Figure 2. This shows the first step . . . "

P.10 The "card sorting method"- there needs to be a description of what this is - and possibly a reference if it is a common method. I don't know what the card sorting method is.

p.10 "Fig 1 presents the consensus model" - not clear- does this mean the final model agreed upon after the analysis??. This paragraph could be clearer it seems confusing and does not relate well to the actual figure - maybe there needs to be some subheadings in the figure of -design of the marketing activity'; the actual composition and implementation; and the consumer. ???

P.11 under Cluster data and Knowledge insert the words 'forms of " before the word "information that had been...' 

Final paragraph on p.19 - this paragraph seems out of left-field- I don't think the
study justifies or suggests that there may be benefits of public private partnerships. I think the benefits are more to do with the disciplines of marketing and public health sharing insights. There may be some justification for the use of the marking success factors for use by public health to promote fruit and vegetable consumption however- give that these are healthy and under consumed.

Another important public health implication is the value to INDUSTRY of health claims legislation and rules around promoting health claims in advertising - given the importance of this as a success factor for effective marketing. this paper shows why industry pushes so hard to be able to make health claims. Health claims on foods is a policy area hotly contested by public health (at least in NZ and Australia) as they are deemed to be just marketing ploys and confusing to the consumer.

There are also some minor punctuation errors and the manuscript overall could do with a final thorough edit. Make sure that the tables and figures are introduced in the order they appear as well.

Otherwise a great paper. It offers a unique insight from marketing that will be of interest and use to those in public health fields. The methods are also sound.
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