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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for an important contribution to the literature on workplace-based nutrition interventions.

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

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.

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"

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

p7, line 108. Reference required for Cochrane SR method

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

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

p22, lines 386-388 - this is too vague - what kind of "favourable results" are you referring to?

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