

RESPONSE TO EDITORS AND REVIEWERS

BMJ.2018.045984 entitled "Tobacco Industry Involvement in the Children's Sugary Beverage Market"

EDITORS

COMMENT: Thank you for revising your paper and for your patience while we have been considering it. We appreciate the importance of your work and would like towards publication.

RESPONSE: Thank you.

COMMENT: It has taken some time for us to consider whether Analysis is the right section for your article and how it can best fit within the section. Several senior editors covering different sections of the journal have now discussed your paper. We think, and hope you agree, that the way forward is to work towards publishing your article within the analysis section but with further revision to bring the paper more in line with the usual scholarly debate articles we publish in Analysis.

RESPONSE: We agree.

COMMENT: Analysis is a distinct article type at The BMJ, and differs from other sections such as Research, Education, Editorials, and Personal Views. A great Analysis article makes an argument and supports it with data. It has academic heft yet is a journalistic read. Full guidance for authors is available on our website (<https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/article-types>), scroll down to the section on 'additional requirements by article type', as is our archive of previously published Analysis articles (<http://www.bmj.com/uk/news/analysis>).

RESPONSE: Thank you. We followed the guidance provided. The revised introduction lays out an argument about relationships between the tobacco and beverage industries, which is then supported by evidence in subsequent subsections.

COMMENT: We think in order for the article to work for the analysis section, the article should put forward a clear argument and offer a greater discussion of the current policy implications.

RESPONSE: We have added a subsection on policy implications in accordance with the editor's suggestions (see pp. 13). We expanded this discussion to more fully address current implications for policy.

COMMENT: We accept your point that the more descriptive elements of the paper are necessary to support your discussion, so we wondered about a different framing where the paper shines new light on the intersection of tobacco and SSB marketing but clearly puts these historical efforts in broad context and explains the significance for public health efforts today.

RESPONSE: We agree and have reframed the paper in the manner that you recommend, declaring at the outset that the paper shines new light on the intersection of the tobacco and SSB industries.

COMMENT: We hope that you will be willing to revise your manuscript and submit it within 4-6 weeks. When submitting your revised manuscript please provide a point by point response to our comments and those of any reviewers. The usual word count for analysis is 1800-2000 words; we are willing to offer an extension to this but ask that you keep the revised manuscript within 3000 words

RESPONSE: Thank you for the word count extension. The revised manuscript has less than 3000 words (word count: 2909).

COMMENT: Please note that resubmitting your manuscript does not guarantee eventual acceptance, and that your revision may be sent again for review.

RESPONSE: Understood.