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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you very much indeed for your comments.

Dr. Miranda Blake (Reviewer 1)

1. You have addressed all concerns from the initial review comprehensively.

⇒Thank you very much for your help.

Thank you very much indeed for your comments.

Dr. Liza Barbour (Reviewer 2)

Reviewer Comments for Manuscript

1. The authors have responded well to comments, I just have a few remaining queries around the definition and results for social marketing strategies.
Abstract- As the title has been updated to include references to social marketing, this should also be included in the abstract. Suggest inserting "social marketing" p.3 line 40 after "financial incentive" such that it reads "…financial incentive or social marketing strategies..."

⇒ The term “social marketing” now appears twice in the abstract. p. 3, lines 43 and 48

2. p.3 Line 49 Suggest insert at end of results "No eligible social marketing studies were retrieved."

⇒ Thank you for this comment. We have now added “No eligible social marketing studies were retrieved” at the end of the Results section. p. 3, lines 53–54

3. p.6 line 91-3. The definition of "social marketing" is a bit different to what would usually be included. "Social marketing" can be much broader, and often refers to public education campaigns. The "4Ps" intervention types you list related more the "choice architecture" is more frequently used these days. In this case, you could use a definition such as from Glanz 2012 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22516491) or Kraak 2017 (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/obr.12553). If you stick with your current definition, then really pricing interventions are a sub-type of those kind of interventions, so in the title for example it might in fact be more appropriate to say "Social marketing including financial incentive programs…".

However, if you are referring to e.g. education programs throughout the workplace (which is what came to mind for me when you said "social marketing") then I suggest you update the definition of social marketing here to be more specific

⇒ Thank you very much for your valuable comments. Yes, we completely agree. We have now modified the title as follows: “Social marketing including financial incentive programs at worksite cafeterias for preventing obesity: a systematic review.”

We have also modified our definition of social marketing and made it more specific, as follows: “We defined ‘social marketing’ as signifying education programs throughout the workplace; however, ‘social marketing’ usually has a much broader meaning, and it often refers to public education campaigns for all places [22, 23].” p. 7, lines 99–102

We have cited the two suggested references by Glanz et al. and Kraak et al. After adding those references, we renumbered the subsequent references accordingly.
4. p.15 Line 258-9. "… and the outcomes might have been affected by high risk of bias" - Suggest deleting this part of the sentence. With the exception of fruit intake, all your included outcomes are objective measures (and not self-reported as for fruit intake). Hence I would say blinding is irrelevant. The fact that participants knew they were eligible to receive price discounts for healthy foods is integral to the intervention and is the mechanism by which it operates (as you say, blinding was impossible).

⇒ Thank you for your suggestion about deleting “and the outcomes might have been affected by this high risk of bias.” p. 15, lines 265–266

We believe, however, that that part of the sentence should stand as it is. Our included intervention studies certainly made it impossible to blind the subjects. Other than objective indicators, such as body weight, fruit intake (24-hour recording method) inevitably carries the possibility of affecting the outcome—unless the subjects are blinded. Therefore, in line with the Cochran Handbook (reference 30), we judged this to be a high-risk bias and believe it should be stated.

5. p.17 line 302-303. Apologies when I asked for clarification on what "sales data" related to, I meant what was the unit of measure? E.g. was it total unit sales at the cafeteria, sales of red/ amber/ green items? Cafeteria profit?

⇒ Thank you very much for that comment. We have now added a clarification about “sales data” as follows: “sales data’ signifies cafeteria register data, which were the total unit sales at the cafeteria.” p. 18, lines 309–310