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Reviewer's report:

This review addresses a potentially useful intervention and generally seems rigorously conducted. It could be strengthened by further explaining the rationale and implications of workplace interventions and some clarifications as detailed below.

Abstract

line 42-46 Please specify outcome of interest

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.

p.4 PICOS criteria: outcome "Change in fibre intake"-units should be g

Introduction- The rationale for selecting workplace settings could really be strengthened in the introduction and also implications of interventions in this setting in discussion.

Line 69- Should this refer to limiting "...added sugar including those in juice"?

Line 71- Please specify "polyunsaturated and monounsaturated lipids"

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

Line 101-103 please specify outcomes of interest in Objective (according to PICO)

Line 119-"Change in fibre intake"-units should be g

Methods

Results

Line 207 - 208. More detail on the magnitudes of different pricing discounts would be helpful
Line 259-262. Please clarify whether this refers to differences between intervention and control groups at baseline.

Line 269- suggest renaming to indicate this section refers to outcomes

Line 288- please elaborate on "sales data" effects- does this mean changes in purchasing outcomes?

Discussion

Line 325- please check throughout for "people first language" - i.e. "individuals with obesity" not "obese individuals" as per World Obesity Federation guidelines

Line 365-366. Unsure what this line adds, as the lines above indicate that the feedback was considered in decision-making?

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

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