Peer Review Report

Review Report on Impact of measures aiming to reduce sugars intake in the general population and their implementation in Europe: a scoping review

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Peter Von Philipsborn

EVALUATION

> **Q 1** Please summarize the main theme of the review.

This scoping review summarizes the results of existing systematic reviews of measures intended to reduce population-level sugar intake. Besides, it provides an overview on relevant measures implemented in European countries, based on the NOURISHING database by the World Cancer Research Fund International.

> **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The review addresses a question of high public health and policy relevance, is clearly structured, and reads well. The study design – a scoping review of existing systematic reviews – is appropriate for the study's aims. The main limitation is, in my view, that the classification of interventions is counter-intuitive, and not well explained.

> **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

Peer reviewer feedback on "Impact of measures aiming to reduce sugars intake in the general population and their implementation in Europe: a scoping review"

This is a well-written and well-conducted scoping review on an important topic, and I recommend it for publication. There are, however, a number of issues which should be addressed beforehand.

General comments:

Reporting guideline: Please use an appropriate reporting guideline to make sure that you report all information expected for a scoping review in a structured manner. The most widely used reporting guideline for scoping reviews is the PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/ScopingReviews). Please also consider the PRISMA extension for abstracts (http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/Abstracts). Please include the relevant checklists in the online appendix.

Protocol: Please state if your review is based on a protocol developed before the review was conducted, and if the protocol is publicly available. Please also include a statement on protocol fidelity, including a statement on whether differences between protocol and review are explained.

Specific comments:

Cover page, section on Contribution to the field (" This scoping review shows that three types of measures have been studied in systematic reviews, including economic tools, product reformulation and labels, and education/environmental interventions.") These three categories (or types) of measures seem to be

overlapping – e.g., labels and economic tools are generally considered to be environmental interventions. Besides, it is unclear why product reformulation and labels were lumped together. Please explain, and consider using a more conventional classification.

Cover page, section on Contribution to the field ("…were beneficial on sugar intake"): I suppose that this means that they reduced sugar intake. Please consider making this explicit.

Cover page, section on Contribution to the field: Please explain the abbreviation SSB the first time you use it.

Page 3, line 82–83 ("Following a scientific report on sugar which was commissioned by XXX (13), we conducted a scoping review in two steps..") Did your review follow this report, or was it the basis or part of this report? Please clarify.

Page 5, line 121–124 ("To categorize the measures used to reduce sugar consumption, we employed categories similar to those of Kirkpatrick et al.: 1) economic tools including taxes, 2) product reformulation and labels, and 3) education/environmental interventions.") See my comments on this classification above. I find is very counter-intuitive. As a minimum, please explain how this classification was derived, and how the categories are defined. Besides, I would strongly recommend using a more conventional classification system (e.g. the one used by the NOURISHING database).

Page 5, line 127–134: Please state the date of your search of the NOURISHING database.

Page 7–8, line 192–194 ("Regarding the use of food labels, the SR of von Philipsborn et al. found a moderate negative association between labelling and SSBs sales. A low negative association was found between nutritional rating score labelling and SSB sales.") Please note that the review of von Philipsborn et al. found evidence of moderate certainty that traffic light labelling can reduce SSB sales – this is not the same as saying that there was a moderate negative association. (Your wording suggests that the effect size or the strength of association was moderate; by contrast, what the review says is that the certainty of evidence for this association is moderate, which is not the same thing). Please reword for clarity.

Page 8–9, line 220–223 ("The success rates were 90% for legislative/environmental approaches, 65% for educational/behavioral interventions, and 67% for a combination of educational/behavioral and legislative/environmental approaches.": Please state how the "success rate" was defined in this review.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?**

Yes

Q 5 **Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)**

Yes.

Q 6 **Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner**

Yes.

Q 7   Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 8   Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes

Q 9   Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 10   Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 11   Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 12   Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

		Rating
Q 13	Quality of generalization and summary	■■■■□
Q 14	Significance to the field	■■■■□
Q 15	Interest to a general audience	■■■■□
Q 16	Quality of the writing	■■■■□

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17   Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.