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Author’s response to reviews:

Date: June 4th, 2019

To: Natalie Pafitis and Eva Szunyogova

Editors, BMC Public Health

Original article: “Development of the Chilean front-of-package food warning label”

Dear Editors:

We are enclosing a revised version of the article “Development of the Chilean front-of-package food warning label”, by M. Reyes, M.L. Garmendia, S. Olivares, C. Aqueveque, I. Zacarias and C. Corvalán. This new version has been edited according to the suggestions of the reviewers and editor. In brief, we have rephrased some sentences for increasing clarity and accuracy. We below provide a point-by-point response to each of the comments.

I certify that all authors have participated substantially either in the conception, data acquisition, analysis and writing of this work. The new version of this manuscript has been reviewed and approved by the authors who take public responsibility for its content. There are no competing interests to report.
My co-authors and I thank you for reviewing and accepting our manuscript for being published in BMC Public Health, and hope the new version is appropriate for proceeding with the publication.

Sincerely,

Camila Corvalán, M.D., Ph.D.
Institute of Nutrition and Food Technology (INTA), University of Chile
El Líbano 5524, Casilla 138-11, Macul, Santiago, Chile
email: ccorvalan@inta.uchile.cl

Dear editor and reviewers,

We would like to thank again the comments and suggestions provided in this second review process.

EDITOR COMMENTS:

1. Please see and address the Reviewer comments, below

   RESPONSE: Please see responses/comments after each requirement.

2. Please remove the funding information from the Acknowledgements and include it in the Funding section instead.

   RESPONSE: Both actions were undertaken.

3. Thank you for uploading your COREQ checklist. As this file is no longer required at this stage of the editorial process, please remove it from your submission.
RESPONSE: The COREQ checklist is not part of the current submission.

4. Please upload your revised manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. Please also ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication.

RESPONSE: The revised version is clean and we have ensured that all figures, tables and supplementary files are cited in the text.

REVIEWER REPORTS:

Paula Dworatzek, PhD RD (Reviewer 1): I am quite satisfied with the authors responses to reviewer comments and believe the manuscript has been improved. i have no further comments.

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for her positive comment about our manuscript and her previous suggestions, which were very helpful for improving the current version of the manuscript.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2):

GENERAL COMMENTS: The manuscript is certainly easier to read and now contains a lot more detail that better highlight the circumstances and the uniqueness of the Chilean experience.

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for this comment and also appreciate his/her previous suggestions that helped improving the manuscript.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Thank you for responding to my earlier comments. I have a few additional comments and suggestions that the authors may want to consider.

Line 44 in the Abstract - are the authors certain it is 'excess of' and not 'high in' that they want to include here?

RESPONSE: We are certain about using ‘excess of’ given these were the words actually tested in our study. In the abstract, we added at the end of the results a sentence that explains that
excess was replaced by “high in” in the final implementation of the law “Due to legal reasons the “excess of” was replaced by “high-in” in the final implementation of the law”

Line 60 - is this true of anemia and other micronutrient deficiencies associated with overweight and obesity?
RESPONSE: This is true for anemia and several micronutrients, anemia prevalence among adult women was 5% in the 2003 national health survey, and hemoglobin was no longer assessed in further surveys. However, the sentence might not be correct for some other micronutrients as vitamin D or others. The sentence has been changed for a more accurate one: “Currently, Chile is considered a post-transitional country because obesity and diet-related non-communicable diseases (NCDs) are the major causes of death and disability while stunting, and anemia have been almost eradicated.”

Line 63 - given that the data is presented in the Chilean context, perhaps it would be helpful to either stick to Chile or provide global figures too before contextualizing the universality of overweight.
RESPONSE: The sentence has been edited in line with the comment: “These figures illustrate the NCDs epidemic the country is undergoing, which has been also reported for other in other developing economies.”

Line 73 - spelling out 'years' might be helpful :) 
RESPONSE: Done.

Line 85 - was the food industry (clarify food!) opposed to the traffic light labels in Chile initially? Interesting! It may actually be worth adding one more sentence here on what label they endorsed at the time.
RESPONSE: Correct, during the parliament discussion food industry argued against the traffic light labels and stood for the GDA system. The current sentence reads: “Moreover, food industry also confronted the use of the traffic-light in favor of GDA (..)”.

Line 87 - rephrase please!
RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for noticing this. We have rephrased: “(…) therefore, a more general description of the label was agreed for the approval of the Law in the senate, with no further specification on the design or wording, but with the indication the label should clearly flag packaged foods with high content of key nutrients and warn about that condition.”

Line 89 - no examples on food packages …
RESPONSE: The sentence has been edited in line with the comment.

Line 126 - would these be the same as focus group discussions where the MetPLan technique supplemented the interview guide?
RESPONSE: Yes, those were focus group discussions using the Metaplan technique.

Line 160/ 161 - these were past research consultants or past researchers? As is currently stated it is unclear what expertise these experts had.
RESPONSE: We agree that the wording was confuse; we have revised the paragraph and now it is as follow: “The final group was composed by 14 experts of nutrition, social science, public policy, marketing and trade scholars, as well as representatives of consumer’s organization, scientific societies, government and senate; most of them have no prior formal connection with the researchers of this study.”

Lines 226 - 247 - this is one section where the authors might consider different formatting. The use of graded bullet points instead of roman number italics (i) to both introduce the section and highlight the results might be one such change. If the authors choose to use (i) to introduce the section, maybe they could use (a) for the results presented.
RESPONSE: We appreciate this suggestion and have now used (a) and (b) for highlighting the results.

Line 277 - this is section is inconsistently capitalized. Please check!
RESPONSE: we have reviewed all the results section to check for consistency.
Lines 323 - 325 - unclear. Could the authors re-phrase please?

RESPONSE: We have rephrased as follow: “In fact, in our study the lay audience group meetings indicated a preference for detailed information in the labels; however, the results of the Quantitative Phase showed that simpler prototypes performed better than the ones displaying more information.”

Line 337 - perhaps the authors meant front face or front panel of the product?

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for noticing this misspelling, we have changed ‘phase’ by ‘face’.

Line 348 - mixed methods approach?

RESPONSE: Changed.

Could the sample size, N, be included in the headings of Tables 1 and 2?

RESPONSE: We believe the reviewer referred to Tables 2 and 3 and have edited accordantly.