

## 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>	Undisclosed financial ties between guideline writers and pharmaceutical companies: a cross-sectional study across ten disease categories
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Moynihan, Ray; Lai, Alexandra; Jarvis, Huw; Duggan, Geraint; Goodrick, Stephanie; Beller, Elaine; Bero, Lisa

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Carolyn Canfield University of British Columbia, Canada
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	20-Sep-2018

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The public, patients, researchers and medical practitioners rely on guidelines to reflect the best evidence and clinical experience. This exposé of shockingly widespread failures of guideline writers to disclose pharmaceutical company relationships is important to all those audiences. The Australian guideline stewardship NHMRC can now address the problem, understanding its scale and seriousness. This strong message should galvanize guideline developers and promulgators globally to clean up their conflict of interest enforcement. Meanwhile, patients and practitioners have grounds for asking hard questions about the trustworthiness of guidelines in daily use. The strength of the manuscript is clear presentation in writing style and results graphics. Thank you for the opportunity to review this submission to BMJ Open as a patient reviewer. I heartily recommend its publication.
-------------------------	--

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Thank you for the news about acceptance on October 17, and subsequent emails about how to complete the outstanding steps with electronic submission.

In response to your email from yesterday November 5, I have uploaded a clean version of the main document - which has no highlighted text or any tracked changes in it - that I can see.

As requested yesterday, I have also uploaded a Tracked Changes version of the manuscript - which is the same document that was emailed to the BMJ Open Editorial Office on the 25th or 26th of August. Apart from changing one url on page 5 of the clean manuscript, which I did today because the old url was out-of-date due to a new website at the NHMRC, there have been no other changes to the text of the manuscript since that submission on the 25th or 26th of August.

I have also uploaded a pdf of the supplementary file, as requested in the email from you yesterday.

Please let me know if there are any outstanding issues.