

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Achieving a Tobacco-Free Bangladesh by 2040: A Qualitative Analysis of the Tobacco Advertising Environment and Prohibitions in Bangladesh
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Tselengidis, Arsenios; Adams, Sally; Freeman, Becky; Alam, Syed; Astuti, Putu; Cranwell, Jo

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Heike Garritsen Amsterdam UMC Locatie AMC, Department of Public and Occupational Health
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	29-Nov-2022

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Review BMJ Open</p> <p>This is an interesting and well written manuscript on TAPS in Bangladesh. I only have a few minor comments. I look forward to seeing the improved manuscript.</p> <p><b>Abstract</b> The results section of your abstract is very short, especially in relation to the background and methods sections. As a reader, I'm above all interested in the results. Please consider to shorten the background/methods and to expand the results.</p> <p><b>Background</b> Overall, the background section is clearly written. I have three minor comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Could you add (for example, between brackets) which smokeless form of tobacco is most common in Bangladesh?</li><li>2. "The Prime Minister's speech prioritised the effective implementation of the national tobacco control law...". It is not clear what law you are referring to. Please clarify.</li><li>3. "We also identified TPAS policy...". I think you mean TAPS?</li></ol> <p><b>Methods</b> It is not clear to me why you choose to describe your methods in a supplementary file. This is very important information for your manuscript. The maximum word count for this journal is 4000, so you have almost 1000 words left.</p> <p><b>Results</b> The results are well written and very extensive. Please check your grammar/spelling. Just two examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. "...such contributing to drafting the national tobacco control law...". The word 'as' is missing after 'such'.</li><li>2. "...however local tobacco control advocates monitor and</li></ol>
-------------------------	--

	publish evidence these activities...”. There is a word missing after ‘evidence’.  Discussion The discussion section would benefit from a ‘conclusion’, after the limitations section. What is your key message?
--	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Kamaruzzaman Abdul Manan Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	06-Jan-2023

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	This research idea is good. But this article needs corrections. A clear flow is required. The research objectives need to be more precise. The researcher must explain how the methodology can help achieve the research questions. Moreover, the data presentation also needs to be clear and explain how each data presented related to RQ. The discussion also can be improved by critically arguing about the findings and their importance. The conclusion can highlight why the result is such and what is important knowledge this research can highlight. Then what is the researcher's recommendation to the others?
-------------------------	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Review BMJ Open

This is an interesting and well written manuscript on TAPS in Bangladesh. I only have a few minor comments. I look forward to seeing the improved manuscript.

Thank you for dedicating your time for reviewing this study. We appreciated all of your comments as they help us improve our manuscript.

Abstract

The results section of your abstract is very short, especially in relation to the background and methods sections. As a reader, I'm above all interested in the results. Please consider to shorten the background/methods and to expand the results.

We have amended the text accordingly (tracked version, page 2, lines 24-25, and page 3, lines 1-4).

Background

Overall, the background section is clearly written. I have three minor comments:

1. Could you add (for example, between brackets) which smokeless form of tobacco is most common in Bangladesh?

Thank you for this recommendation. We have now included the four most common forms (page 4, lines 24-25)

2. “The Prime Minister’s speech prioritised the effective implementation of the national tobacco control law...”. It is not clear what law you are referring to. Please clarify.

We have now included the Act of 2013 and the Rule of 2015, as mentioned within the speech and also later in the same paragraph (page 5, lines 5-6).

3. “We also identified TPAS policy...”. I think you mean TAPS?

We have removed this sentence to provide more precise objectives as requested by the other reviewer (page 6, lines 11-16).

Methods

It is not clear to me why you choose to describe your methods in a supplementary file. This is very important information for your manuscript. The maximum word count for this journal is 4000, so you have almost 1000 words left.

Thank you for providing this comment. To incorporate some clarifying points suggested by the second reviewer, we decided to remove the supplementary file and include the information in the text (pages 7-9).

## Results

The results are well written and very extensive. Please check your grammar/spelling. Just two examples:

1. "...such contributing to drafting the national tobacco control law...". The word 'as' is missing after 'such'.

We have amended the text accordingly (page 13, line 4).

2. "...however local tobacco control advocates monitor and publish evidence these activities...". There is a word missing after 'evidence'.

We have amended the text accordingly (page 19, line 13).

## Discussion

The discussion section would benefit from a 'conclusion', after the limitations section. What is your key message?

Thank you for this suggestion. We have now included one concluding paragraph (page 26, lines 22-25, and page 27, lines 1-10). We have also amended the abstract's conclusion accordingly (page 3, lines 5-8)

## Reviewer: 2

### Comments to the Author:

This research idea is good. But this article needs corrections. A clear flow is required. The research objectives need to be more precise. The researcher must explain how the methodology can help achieve the research questions. Moreover, the data presentation also needs to be clear and explain how each data presented related to RQ. The discussion also can be improved by critically arguing about the findings and their importance. The conclusion can highlight why the result is such and what is important knowledge this research can highlight. Then what is the researcher's recommendation to the others?

Thank you for reviewing this study and for highlighting these issues. To better answer your valuable points, we have split them and answered them separately.

Precise research objectives: We have now amended the abstract (tracked version, page 3, lines 5-12) and the last paragraph of the introduction section (page 6, lines 11-16).

Answering research questions through methodology: We have now included some paragraphs in the methodology section (page 7, lines 1-12) and also explained why the data presentation follows a more critical approach (to uncover the challenges within each HPT component -context, policy process and content, actors) (page 8, lines 4-13).

Data presentation and their relation to research questions: Please refer to previous comment. For further clarity, we also amended the introductory paragraph of the results section (page 12, lines 7-12).

Critical discussion of the findings and their importance: We believe that due to the qualitative nature of the study, a critical point of view was already introduced with the incorporation of the thematic framework approach which seeks to draw explanatory relationships among the data. We have now

reviewed several parts of the discussion section (page 23, lines 1-7, and line 22) in order to highlight the findings' importance for other LMICs similar issues (e.g. advocacy participation in policy making processes and sustainability of tobacco control programs), as well as for outlining the issues remaining to be resolved in Bangladesh (e.g. protection policy making from tobacco industry interference and needs prioritisation).

Conclusion (why such results, important knowledge generated, recommendation for others): We have now included a concluding paragraph (page 26, lines 22-25 and page 27) summarising the important lessons (e.g. importance of tobacco control advocacy in TAPS policy, potential solution for addressing tobacco control programs sustainability, introduction of mechanisms protecting health policy making, strengthening TAPS legislations for achieving tobacco free countries), which could be transferable for other LMICs settings with similar challenges. The abstract's conclusion was amended accordingly (page 3, lines 5-8).

#### **VERSION 2 – REVIEW**

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Heike Garritsen Amsterdam UMC Locatie AMC, Department of Public and Occupational Health
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	11-Apr-2023
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Thank you so much for addressing my comments. To me, the manuscript is now suitable for publication. Good luck!