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Author's response to reviews:

Response to Editor II

Editor: I do not see anything on the revised WHO guidelines on sugar intake in the introduction as the authors state they have been added

Authors: The authors believe that such statement is better placed in the conclusion. It has been added.

Editor: In the methods section the authors say they aimed to find both published and unpublished studies, but it is not clear how they went about searching for unpublished studies.

Authors: We have added this “Moreover, food industries and consumer associations were contacted to know if they were aware of unpublished studies”.

Editor: The full search strategy with terms used needs to be added to the article since this is a systematic review

Authors: we have added the requested table.

Editor: The authors do need to add what they mean with ‘most relevant’ studies.
How were these selected as the ones to be presented in the article?

Authors: It was not systematic but mainly based on novelty, originality and methodology. It has been added in the text.

Editor: Would it be possible to broadly look at whether findings differ between studies funded by industry and those by other sources since in literature this has clearly been shown?

Authors: It was clearly decided, at the start of the working group, to avoid looking at this issue and we have critically reviewed all manuscripts whatever their funding. The funding of research generates a lot of debate in the literature and we would prefer to avoid a bad buzz from our review by using a broad statement regarding the direction of the results in function of the funding. Consequently, we respectfully suggest to avoid adding this information.