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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you very much indeed for your comments.

Dr. Liza Barbour (Reviewer 1)

Reviewer Comments for Manuscript

1. p4. PICOS - intervention can be either financial incentive OR social marketing - why is the title focused on financial incentive only?

⇒ We have now added “social marketing” in the title. p. 1 Title

2. p4. PICOS - what is food consumption a secondary outcome? I would have thought food/nutrient intake is the primary outcome with changes in anthro, biochem, etc as secondary outcomes. This needs clarification/justification.

⇒ Thank you for this comment. According to the Cochrane Systematic Review methodology, primary outcomes usually extend only up to three outcomes; secondary outcomes are usually only up to seven outcomes. Therefore, in our systematic review, we decided to make secondary outcomes for both food intake and food consumption. p. 4 The PICOS criteria
3. p6, line 89-90 Consider replacing "with thanks to the efforts of WHO" and replacing with more academic language eg. "have drawn much attention and have gained such traction due to the efforts of the WHO"

⇒ Thank you for this. We have changed that section to “have drawn considerable attention and gained traction through the efforts of the WHO.” p.7, lines 98–99

4. p6, line 95-98. There is no evidence that nutrition education programs will reduce obesity. This sentence is confusing and is not referenced.

⇒ We have changed that section to “These outcomes are important toward preventing obesity and lifestyle-related diseases among workers; thus, a comprehensive systematic review of them is needed.” We have deleted “to assess the effectiveness of nutritional education programs at the population.” p. 7, lines 105–107

5. P7, line 108. Reference required for Cochrane SR method

⇒ We have added reference [28] p. 8, line 117

6. p12, line 192 - this is confusing as it looks like the original search included interventions with financial incentive OR social marketing then the results yielded only trials with financial-incentives??? This needs to be clear and consistent throughout

⇒ Thank you very much for this valuable comment. We have added the following explanation in the Results section: “No intervention programs used social marketing.” p. 12, lines 202—203

7. " p12, lines 207 - 209 - what do you mean by a 'pricing strategy'. Is this the same as a 'financial discount'? This language is inconsistent or requires clarification/definition

⇒ We meant “pricing strategy” to signify the same as “financial incentive.” As well as price discounts, pricing strategy includes such methods as coupon usage, a points system, and free offers (e.g., at salad bars). We have now consistently used the term “financial incentive” rather than “pricing strategy.” p. 13, lines 216–219 "
8. p22, lines 386-388 - this is too vague - what kind of "favourable results" are you referring to?

⇒ Yes, we agree. We have now modified that sentence as follows: “From our review, we were unable to conclude clearly the impact and effect of incentive-based interventions, such as pricing strategies in the field; such evidence as physical indicators and biochemical test data was insufficient.” p. 23, lines 406–408

9. p21 line 401 - is this a sub-heading like the 'implications for practice'? If so, then it should not be bolded

⇒ Thank you for that comment. We have made that change to p. 24, line 422.

10. Typos in flow diagram: (i) final box should read "qualitative" with one L (ii) "eligible" is spelled "elligible" twice and "elligible" once All the very best

⇒ Thank you very much for that. We have made the change in Fig. 1.

Thank you very much for your comments

Dr. Miranda Blake (Reviewer 2)

1 "Abstract line 42-46

Please specify outcome of interest"

⇒ We evaluated whether financial incentive interventions (such as discounts) were effective for health outcomes or food intake behavior. "Abstract, lines 44–46

2 "p.4 PICOS criteria:
Intervention includes ""social marketing"", however there is no discussion in the introduction or results around why these were originally searched for, or explanations that no relevant trials were found."

⇒ We have added an explanation about social marketing in the Background section. We have also indicated that we could not find social marketing programs in our review. p. 6, lines 91–95; p. 12, lines 202–203

3 "p.4 PICOS criteria:
outcome ""Change in fibre intake""-units should be g"
⇒ Yes. Thank you very much for your comment. We have made that addition on p. 4.

4 "Introduction-
The rationale for selecting workplace settings could really be strengthened in the introduction and also implications of interventions in this setting in discussion."
⇒ We have added explanations in the Background and Discussion sections on p. 6, lines 79–82 and p. 23, lines 418–420.

5 "Line 69-
Should this refer to limiting ""...added sugar including those in juice""? A mean was sugar and added sugar in food (ex. soft drink, cake, etc.).
⇒ We have modified that sentence to “sugar in food.” p. 5, line 70

6 "Line 71-
Please specify ""polyunsaturated and monounsaturated lipids""
⇒ We have inserted “polyunsaturated and monounsaturated” before “lipids.” p. 5, line 72

7 "Line 88-
"sugar tax in the United Kingdom" should be "sugar sweetened beverage tax in the United Kingdom"

⇒ Yes. Thank you so much for that. We have changed “sugar tax” to “sugar-sweetened beverage tax.”  p. 6, line 97

8 "Line 101-103
please specify outcomes of interest in Objective (according to PICO)"
⇒ We have made that change on p. 7, lines 110–111.

9 Line 119-"Change in fibre intake"-units should be g
⇒ Thank you very much for that. We have made the change on p. 8, line 128.

10 "Methods
Results Line 207 - 208.
More detail on the magnitudes of different pricing discounts would be helpful"
⇒ We have made the following additions. For Study 2 (reference 32): “15% discount for low-energy-density or 25% discount for very low-energy-density foods among items”

For Study 1 (reference 31): “35% discount for about two-thirds the size of a standard portion or 20% discount for a smaller portion size, which added to assortment and value-size pricing:

For Study 3 (reference 33): “US$10 a month for achieving the “green goal” with all cafeteria purchases.”  p. 13, lines 216–227

11 "Line 259-262.
Please clarify whether this refers to differences between intervention and control groups at baseline."
⇒ We have now clarified this on p. 16, lines 272–273.
suggest renaming to indicate this section refers to outcomes"  "As you indicated, this subtitle was not suitable.

⇒ Thank you very much. We have modified the name on p. 16, line 283.

13 "Line 288

please elaborate on "'sales data'" effects-does this mean changes in purchasing outcomes ?"

⇒ “Sales data” signifies cafeteria register data. With food purchases recorded at lunchtime, the approximate energy (kcal) and proportion of calories from fat, protein, and carbohydrate were calculated.

We have added that sentence in the paper and modified the “Outcome” section in Table 1 (Study 2; p. 6). p. 17, lines 302–305; Table 1 (Study 2 “Outcome,” p. 6)

14 "Discussion Line 325-

please check throughout for "'people first language'" - i.e. "'individuals with obesity'" not "'obese individuals'" as per World Obesity Federation guidelines "

⇒ We have made the change to “individuals with obesity.” p. 19, line 342.

15 "Line 365-366.

Unsure what this line adds, as the lines above indicate that the feedback was considered in decision-making? "

⇒ Thank you for this comment. We strictly conducted our review based on our protocol. In line with that protocol, we did not analyze three excluded papers. We were somewhat unsure about the sentence you mention. We decided that the matter here relates to the protocol, not to the results of the review. Therefore, we decided that for clarity it would be better to delete the sentence.

16 "Table 1, p.6."
Thorndike- Outcomes are listed as "Primary: None and Secondary: Inappropriate". What was the basis for inclusion of this study?

⇒ We based our methodology on the Cochrane Systematic Review. We included all trials that had the same PICO. We did not make any judgments about including or excluding according to primary or secondary outcomes. For example, if we could identify a good trial that had the same PICO but no primary and secondary outcomes, we included it. In such cases, we could clearly say that there was no outcome.

17 " Flow diagram 1 has a number of spelling errors, e.g. exclusion box "eligible"

⇒ Thank you very much for bringing that to our attention. We have corrected it in Fig. 1.