

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

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Is the alcohol industry doing well by "doing good"? Findings from a content analysis of the alcohol industry's Actions to Reduce Harmful Drinking
AUTHORS	Babor, Thomas F; Robaina, Katherine; Brown, Katherine; Noel, Jonathan; Cremonte, Mariana; Pantani, Daniela; Peltzer, Raquel; Pinsky, Ilana

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Damir Sekulic University of Split, Croatia
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Jun-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Nice article, well-done study, important and "ecologically valid" findings. I have provided some minor comments which will hopefully improve the readability of the paper.</p> <p>Abstract: Page 2, line 5. Consider including one sentence on study background before the aim of the study Article Summary: This is up to Editor - Do you have to define abbreviations in each part of the text? Page 4; line 47: Is this the proper way or citing web page? Page 5; line 22-36: I'd rather see this paragraph following the study aims (line 38 onward) Page 6, line 33: provide more details on SPSS software Page 7 and 8: The text where you explain "measures and outcomes" is difficult to follow. I strongly suggest authors to use some type of table where you will identify different measures and outcomes. It will be more understandable (actually, I had to do one for myself in order to better understand the measures and outcomes) Discussion: Personally, I prefer discussions starting with the main study findings which will be later used as "subheadings" (not necessarily formally entitled, but divided by all means). It will allow fluency in the reading of this (relatively complicated) topic. Conclusion-section is too long. Some parts actually belong to Discussion (e.g. "More recently one transnational, etc. - this part also needs reference). I'd like to see some kind of critic and/or summary of finding here, rather than continuation of discussion.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Ian Gilmore University of Liverpool UK
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Jun-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is an excellent attempt to look objectively at the behaviour of the alcohol industry and, given the constraints of the methodology,
-------------------------	--

	could not have been done more thoroughly. The findings concur with smaller and less objective analyses
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 Comments:

Abstract: Page 2, line 5. Consider including one sentence on study background before the aim of the study

RESPONSE: We concur with this suggestion, however as the instructions specify that the structured abstract for research articles be followed, we have not added a background sentence to the abstract. (We previously had a background heading in the abstract, but the system would not accept it for submission).

Article Summary: This is up to Editor - Do you have to define abbreviations in each part of the text?

RESPONSE: Abbreviations are now defined in the Article Summary and abstract. There is also a list of abbreviations towards the end of the document. If the Editors do not require definitions in the Summary, we might suggest they be deleted in the interest of "readability."

Page 4; line 47: Is this the proper way of citing web page?

RESPONSE: This was not noted under formatting amendments so we believe this is acceptable. However, we are willing to follow the editor's recommendation if there is a better way to do it.

Page 5; line 22-36: I'd rather see this paragraph following the study aims (line 38 onward)

RESPONSE: This paragraph has been moved. We thank the reviewer for this suggestion.

Page 6, line 33: provide more details on SPSS software

RESPONSE: Page 9, line 33 states "Data was analyzed using SPSS for Windows Version 24 (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.)." Additional detail has now been added to Page 6, line 33, which now reads, "SPSS for Windows Version 24 was used to select the 30% sample."

Page 7 and 8: The text where you explain "measures and outcomes" is difficult to follow. I strongly suggest authors to use some type of table where you will identify different measures and outcomes. It will be more understandable (actually, I had to do one for myself in order to better understand the measures and outcomes)

RESPONSE: Thank you for this suggestion. We have developed a new table which describes this better (see new table 1; other tables have now been renumbered).

Discussion: Personally, I prefer discussions starting with the main study findings which will be later used as "subheadings" (not necessarily formally entitled, but divided by all means). It will allow fluency in the reading of this (relatively complicated) topic.

RESPONSE: The discussion has been revised with this comment in mind.

Conclusion: Section is too long. Some parts actually belong to Discussion (e.g. "More recently one transnational, etc. - this part also needs reference). I'd like to see some kind of critic and/or summary

of finding here, rather than continuation of discussion.

RESPONSE: We shortened the Conclusion to focus on the main message stated in the Abstract. We deleted the sentence identified by the reviewer as belonging in the Discussion ("more recently....) because it was too speculative, and moved several sentences about the WHO tobacco control measures into the Discussion.

Reviewer 2 Comments:

This is an excellent attempt to look objectively at the behaviour of the alcohol industry and, given the constraints of the methodology, could not have been done more thoroughly. The findings concur with smaller and less objective analyses

RESPONSE: We greatly appreciate these comments. Thank you.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Damir Sekulic University of Split, Split, Croatia
REVIEW RETURNED	08-Aug-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for following my previous comments.