# PEER REVIEW HISTORY

This paper was submitted to a another journal from BMJ but declined for publication following peer review. The authors addressed the reviewers' comments and submitted the revised paper to BMJ Open. The paper was subsequently accepted for publication at BMJ Open.

## ARTICLE DETAILS

| TITLE (PROVISIONAL) | "It is merely a paper tiger." The battle for increased tobacco advertising regulation in Indonesia: A content analysis of news articles |
|---|---|
| AUTHORS | Astuti, Putu; Freeman, Becky |

## VERSION 1 - REVIEW

| REVIEWER | McDaniel, Patricia<br>University of California, San Francisco, Social and Behavioral Sciences |
|---|---|
| REVIEW RETURNED | 05-Jan-2017 |

| GENERAL COMMENTS | As the authors point out, analysis of media coverage of tobacco control is an important component of tobacco control policy progress. This paper would be a stronger addition to the literature on media analyses if the introduction, results, and discussion were shorter and more streamlined and if more information on methods were offered. There are also numerous grammatical errors throughout the paper which must be addressed. (See Malone RE, Barnoya J. Coauthorship and 'soft colonialism.' Tob Control 2015;24:315). |
|---|---|
| | As an example of what could be done to shorten the piece, the introduction could more narrowly focus on PP 109/2012, and explain why it is important to analyze media coverage of the legislation after it was adopted (as opposed to before, when it might be assumed that the results could more directly inform tobacco control efforts in support of the passage of the legislation). Similarly, the discussion is much too long and should focus on the implications of the findings for future tobacco control efforts in Indonesia, particularly given the weaknesses noted in the legislation and the preponderance of arguments that support enhancing it or scaling it up, versus health-focused arguments. |
| | More details on the methods are needed. You should include some sense of the scope of news items indexed in Factiva and Google News -- do each index thousands of news sources or only a handful? Among the items retrieved, how many came from each database, and from what types of news sources? Were they mostly opinion pieces? Why did you limit your search to the time period after the regulation was signed? How did coders identify an "argument" (as opposed to statements of fact, for example)? Toward the end of the methods section, you mention 7 coders – they need to |

be introduced earlier. Why were there so many? How many news items did each code? To establish inter-coder reliability, did they each code the same 20 randomly selected news items? You should report the Kappa result here, not in the results section. You mention distilling your analysis to 10 categories denoting support of the legislation on page 7, 9 categories on page 8, and 10 categories on page 10. Which is it? Are the individuals/actors you identify on page 8 people who were quoted in news items and/or authors of news pieces/press releases?

You need to re-think your use of the term "arguments." In the results section, you note that you found 436 arguments across 201 news items, which suggests that you identified 436 unique arguments. However, you later categorize these 436 "arguments" into 10 categories of "arguments," which is confusing. It would be clearer to state that you identified 436 unique statements (about the legislation?) made by various actors and then categorized those into N arguments advanced in support of the legislation, and N arguments in opposition.

I also question whether it is appropriate to categorize statements that highlight the ineffectiveness of the legislation as "supportive." They suggest support for stronger tobacco control measures, but not support for the current approach. Similarly, statements from the tobacco industry that support the legislation and oppose the FCTC do not seem to merit the label "opposition" to this particular legislation.

| REVIEWER | Myers, Allison |
| | University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Health Behavior |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 29-Jan-2017 |

| GENERAL COMMENTS | This is an important paper to characterize news media content about the enactment and implementation of an important tobacco control policy. Both the policy and the study of news content add value to the field. The paper would benefit from revision to streamline the wording throughout, so that the reader is better able to follow the manuscript. The most necessary improvements to the paper, in my opinion, are to define "arguments" as they were coded in articles, to provide examples for each argument that is discussed, and to strengthen the description of the methods and rationale. With regard to rationale, I was confused about "partial" versus "complete" implementation of the policy -- additional clarity there would be helpful. I was also confused about "local" versus "national" level enactment of the policy. It seems to me that the authors want to provide evidence-based counterarguments in the discussion section to those that were identified in the results/study. This would be helpful to the field and could use one more round of revision to draw these clear points out of the writing. |

## VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Response to reviewer 1

Thank you for your review of the paper. We have answered each of your points below.

1. This paper would be a stronger addition to the literature on media analyses if the introduction, results, and discussion were shorter and more streamlined and if more information on methods were offered.

   Response: We kept the length of the intoduction to provide description about the setting (Indonesia) since there are not many paper available on Indonesia. Similarly for the discussion, Reveiwer 2 has also noted that the discussion aim to provide evidence based counter argument. For the method section, we provide clarification and revision on responses below.

2. More details on the methods are needed. You should include some sense of the scope of news items indexed in Factiva and Google News -- do each index thousands of news sources or only a handful?
   Response: Factiva indexes a wide range of newspapers, newswires, and other type of publications from over 36000 sources, whilst Google News aggregates headlines from news sources worldwide. (p6, line 16-18)

3. Among the items retrieved, how many came from each database, and from what types of news sources? Were they mostly opinion pieces?

   Response: In total, 213 news items, 55 from Factiva and 158 from Google News were included in the final analysis. (p10, line 3-4)

4. Why did you limit your search to the time period after the regulation was signed?

   Response: because we want to see the arguments made for the adoption and implementation, it showed in the objective of the study. (p6, line 8)

5. How did coders identify an "argument" (as opposed to statements of fact, for example)? Toward the end of the methods section, you mention 7 coders – they need to be introduced earlier. Why were there so many? How many news items did each code? To establish inter-coder reliability, did they each code the same 20 randomly selected news items?

   Response: We provide codebook for each coders as a guidance for the coding process We used 7 coders to have a better sense on the reliability, this has been done in other study (1). Each coders coded the same randomly selected articles, this is mentioned in the method section (p9, line 13-14)

6. You should report the Kappa result here, not in the results section.

   Response: The Kappa could be presented in the result section (1) or in the method section (2). For this paper we keep it in the result section (p10, line 9-10)

7. You mention distilling your analysis to 10 categories denoting support of the legislation on page 7, 9 categories on page 8, and 10 categories on page 10. Which is it?

   Response: On page 7 we stated that there is 1 other category for both in support and opposed arguments, so it make in total 19 categories. We also provide table 1 for all categories with its definition on the revised paper. (p7 line 23-p8, line 1-3 and line 5)

8. Are the individuals/actors you identify on page 8 people who were quoted in news items and/or authors of news pieces/press releases?

   Response: Yes, it stated in the method section. (p9, line 1)

9. I also question whether it is appropriate to categorize statements that highlight the ineffectiveness of the legislation as "supportive." They suggest support for stronger tobacco control measures, but not support for the current approach. Similarly, statements from the tobacco industry that support the legislation and oppose the FCTC do not seem to merit the label "opposition" to this particular legislation.

Response: We think that is still appropriate since we define the in support argument as those supported either the regulation or enhanced tobacco control measures while the opposed argument as those that watering down the regulation, hampering/delaying the implementation of the regulation and took a negative view towards tobacco control efforts. (P7, line 16-20)

Response to reviewer 2

Thank you for your review of the paper. We have answered each of your points below.

1. The most necessary improvements to the paper, in my opinion, are to define "arguments" as they were coded in articles, to provide examples for each argument that is discussed, and to strengthen the description of the methods and rationale.

Response: We provide table 1 on the revised paper to describe the definition of the arguments and provide example to each arguments. (p7, line 5)

2. With regard to rationale, I was confused about "partial" versus "complete" implementation of the policy -- additional clarity there would be helpful.

Response: In the rationale, we did not mentioned partial versus complete implementaion of the policy. Instead We mentioned that...the regulation has not fully met the expectations of tobacco control advocates since it only partially bans TAPS. (p5, line 15-16). We think this is quite clear.

3. I was also confused about "local" versus "national" level enactment of the policy

Response: Indonsia has decentralised governments structure comprise national government and sub-national/local governments (provinces, districts/cities). To clarify this on the revised paper, We change local governments into sub-national governments and local regulation into bylaw (law enacted by sub-national governments).

REFERENCE

1. Freeman B. Tobacco plain packaging legislation: a content analysis of commentary posted on Australian online news. Tobacco Control. 2011;20(5):361-6.
2. Durrant R, Wakefield M, McLeod K, Clegg-Smith K, Chapman S. Tobacco in the news: an analysis of newspaper coverage of tobacco issues in Australia, 2001. Tobacco Control. 2003;12(Suppl II):ii75-ii81.

**VERSION 2 – REVIEW**

| REVIEWER | K. Michael Cummings<br>Medical University of South Carolina, USA<br><br>I have received payment as an expert witness against cigarette |
| --- | --- |

| | manufacturers |
|---|---|
| **REVIEW RETURNED** | 18-May-2017 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **GENERAL COMMENTS** | This is a nicely written paper retrospectively reviewing the content of news articles either in support of or opposing Indonesian's tobacco control regulation enacted at the end of 2012. The 2912 regulations placed stricter control on tobacco product marketing, required pictorial health warnings on cigarette packs and prohibited the sale of cigarettes to those under 18 years old. The authors acknowledge that implementation of the law has been sub-optimal. This study examines coverage of the law between December 2012 and February 2016 in an effort to assess the arguments made in support and against implementation of the law. The methods used for coding the arguments made for or against the law from news articles are well described and appear to have reasonable reliability based on a sub-sample of articles that were independently coded allowing for inter-observer agreement to assessed. Table 3 summarizes the findings which show more articles favoring the law than opposing it. The main arguments made in opposition to the law relate to economic concerns. What is not as well described is who is making the arguments for and against the law. The authored alluded to the fact that arguments from opponents of the law not only included tobacco companies, but also government officials, artists, and academics. The paper would be strengthened if the authors could compare the various groups supporting and opposing the law and the arguments coming from these different sources. The sources of the arguments need to be known since research in other countries have often found that the tobacco industry often pays others to make their arguments. In other words lobbying and payment to government officials and support for various front groups by cigarette manufacturers is often found to be associated with arguments made in opposition to tobacco control policies. In the discussion it would be valuable for the authors to comments on the mis-match between arguments made in support of and opposing the law. Mostly supporters of the law are commenting on poor implementation and industry inference; while opponents mainly are focused on adverse economic impacts. Do the authors believe that public health groups should be doing more to counter the false economic arguments being made about the law? In other words what are the implications of the findings for public health? |

| | |
|---|---|
| **REVIEWER** | Dr. Sonu Goel<br>Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, India |
| **REVIEW RETURNED** | 06-Jun-2017 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **GENERAL COMMENTS** | The authors have nicely responded to the comments. The excel sheet with information on arguments may be provided. Further, a flow diagram of search strategy may also be provided for better clarity of methods. Has there been any change in type of arguments (in favour or opposing) over a period of time since 2012. This will depict the advocacy efforts by various stakeholders. It can also be shown in a table. |

| REVIEWER | Bekir KAPLAN<br>Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health<br>Institute for Global Tobacco Control |
|---|---|
| REVIEW RETURNED | 13-Jun-2017 |

| GENERAL COMMENTS | 1- This is an important and well-thought study on tobacco control area in a country where has not ratified FCTC yet. It was pleasure for me to read and review this study although it was very long. Especially introduction section could be shorter, because some the knowledges in introduction may also be found on the internet.<br>2- On table 2, it is mentioned that 19.5% of argument based on National Government was opposed and also 56% of sub-national government. This is very important part of the study. If you discuss in the discussion session this issue in detail in a new subtitle like "Opposite argument of government", it will be very useful for tobacco control advocates in Indonesia. If we learn the opposite argument of government, we can create solution to those argument.<br>3- On page 16 row 35, you mentioned about smuggling that "to markets where tobacco is much more heavily taxed." This sentences may cause to empower of the Tobacco Companies argument about high taxes. The tobacco industry argues that an increase in taxes will negatively affect the country's economy and that it will cause losses in tax revenue due to increased illicit trade of tobacco. In fact, illicit tobacco trade is not directly related to tobacco prices. Illicit trade might be influenced by factors other than price such as cost of operating in a country, industry participation, how well crime networks are organized, the likelihood of being caught, the punishment if caught, and corruption levels. In brief, above mentioned sentence should be dropped than manuscript.<br>4- On page 4 row 44: In addition to presented smoking prevalence change, explaining the smoking prevalence change in the women in Indonesia will enrich the paragraph. Because smoking rate nearly tripled in the women in Indonesia: Between 1995 and 2011, from 1.7% to 4.5%.<br>5- On page 5 row 12: It had better to explain the exact time duration which tobacco ads are allowed on TV as follows: "allowing tobacco commercials to remain on television between 9.30pm and 5.00 am" This will clarify the uncertainty about timing of tobacco ads on TV.<br>6- On page 6 row 24, in the paragraph before "METHOD" title, it had better to explain that what kind of media (visual or print) was evaluated for this study. The term "News media" does not clear about that. Since this is "Aim" sentences, I believe it should be mentioned in here.<br>7- On page 8 row 56, "TI" should be explained as the first mentioned place.<br>8- On page 8 Table 1: If the subtitles "support categories" (before row 25) and "opposed categories" (before row 52) insert the table, the table will be easier to understand. |

<div align="center">VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE</div>

Response to reviewer 1
Thank you for your review of the paper. We have answered each of your points below.
1. Table 3 summarizes the findings which show more articles favoring the law than opposing it. The main arguments made in opposition to the law relate to economic concerns. What is not as well described is who is making the arguments for and against the law. The authored alluded to the fact that arguments from opponents of the law not only included tobacco companies, but also government

officials, artists, and academics. The paper would be strengthened if the authors could compare the various groups supporting and opposing the law and the arguments coming from these different sources. The sources of the arguments need to be known since research in other countries have often found that the tobacco industry often pays others to make their arguments. In other words lobbying and payment to government officials and support for various front groups by cigarette manufacturers is often found to be associated with arguments made in opposition to tobacco control policies.

Response:
We did not provide cross-tabulation between each categories in table 3 and the news actors, because the table will become "too big" (19 x 6) and create very small numbers within the cells.
Instead, we have provided Table 2 that shows the news actors who made arguments in support and opposing the laws (p11, line 1)
Moreover, our analysis did not suggest that there were any specific arguments belonging to any specific group of news actors. For instance, arguments of "losing government income", though it mainly come from the sub-national governments, tobacco industry actors also expressed this same argument. Similarly for arguments of "tobacco farmers' welfare", both government and tobacco industry group used the argument.


2. In the discussion it would be valuable for the authors to comments on the mis-match between arguments made in support of and opposing the law. Mostly supporters of the law are commenting on poor implementation and industry inference; while opponents mainly are focused on adverse economic impacts. Do the authors believe that public health groups should be doing more to counter the false economic arguments being made about the law? In other words what are the implications of the findings for public health?

Response:
We have added this additional content to help further draw attention to this mis-match:
Effective tobacco control is presented as two opposing frames of either an economic disaster versus an essential health measure. Tobacco control stakeholders must go beyond providing evidence that tobacco advertising laws work to reduce smoking rates and also ensure that the false economic arguments are effectively countered (page 16, line 5-8).
In the discussion, we have provided evidence based counter argument for most of the opposing arguments, including false economic, legal or ideological arguments made by the opposing groups. This evidence was based primarily on research conducted in Indonesia. The counter arguments could be adopted by public health advocates in other settings with similar geographic or decentralised political structure. We also highlighted the need for further evidence that should be explored to build stronger counter argument in the future.
We also suggest that the supporting group (public health advocates and government) should be well prepared and more active in countering the opposed groups. We have highlighted this existing text in yellow.


Response to Reviewer 2
1. The excel sheet with information on arguments may be provided.

Response:
We have provided a supplementary file containing the excel spreadsheet of the arguments.

2. Further, a flow diagram of search strategy may also be provided for better clarity of methods.

Response:
A flow diagram of the search strategy has been inserted (p7, line 3)

3. Has there been any change in type of arguments (in favour or opposing) over a period of time since 2012. This will depict the advocacy efforts by various stakeholders. It can also be shown in a table.

Response:
After checking the data, we did not find any clear changes in type of arguments use over time since 2012. The number of articles is not sufficient to show changes in arguments over time since the number categories is relatively big (19 categories in total).
In addition, the scope of our analysis was only on tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship (TAPS) and regulation PP 109/2012. We think the analysis of changes over time would be more appropriate if we explored broader issue covering all news articles about tobacco or tobacco control in general.

Response to Reviewer 3
1. This is an important and well-thought study on tobacco control area in a country where has not ratified FCTC yet. It was pleasure for me to read and review this study although it was very long. Especially introduction section could be shorter, because some the knowledge in introduction may also be found on the internet.

Response:
Thank you for your positive comments. We have shortened the introduction from 778 words into 643 words. Deleted contents showed in the track changes (p3, line 7 and p3,line 20)

2. On table 2, it is mentioned that 19.5% of argument based on National Government was opposed and also 56% of sub-national government. This is very important part of the study. If you discuss in the discussion session this issue in detail in a new subtitle like "Opposite argument of government", it will be very useful for tobacco control advocates in Indonesia. If we learn the opposite argument of government, we can create solution to those argument.

Response:
We construct the discussion based on type of arguments instead of the actors, because the same arguments were used interchangeably by the actors. For instance, national government (ministry of industry) used argument on "losing income" and "tobacco industry welfare. Similarly, sub-national government also stated losing income from decreasing billboard revenue and those who has cigarette factories and farmers in their area also used tobacco farmer/workers welfare. On the other side, the tobacco industry also used the same arguments. Another example, national government (parliament member) used "kretek as heritage" and of course tobacco industry also used the same argument. This signify how deep tobacco industry infiltrate the government system in Indonesia. We mentioned this in the discussion (highlighted in blue)

3. On page 16 row 35, you mentioned about smuggling that "to markets where tobacco is much more heavily taxed." This sentences may cause to empower of the Tobacco Companies argument about high taxes. The tobacco industry argues that an increase in taxes will negatively affect the country's economy and that it will cause losses in tax revenue due to increased illicit trade of tobacco. In fact, illicit tobacco trade is not directly related to tobacco prices. Illicit trade might be influenced by factors other than price such as cost of operating in a country, industry participation, how well crime networks are organized, the likelihood of being caught, the punishment if caught, and corruption levels. In brief, above mentioned sentence should be dropped than manuscript.

Response: We removed the statement about smuggling from the manuscript (page 16, line 22).

We also added this sentence to support the argument in this paragraph.
Partial bans on TAPS enable the tobacco industry to exploit loopholes, circumvent regulations, and shift its marketing to less regulated channels such as event sponsorship and internet-based marketing (page 16, line 20-22)

4. On page 4 row 44: In addition to presented smoking prevalence change, explaining the smoking prevalence change in the women in Indonesia will enrich the paragraph. Because smoking rate nearly tripled in the women in Indonesia: Between 1995 and 2011, from 1.7% to 4.5%.

Response:

Based on data from National Health Survey (Riset Kesehatan Dasar/Riskesdas), prevalence of current smoker among women age >10 years was decreasing from 4.5% in 2007 to 1.9% in 2013. Data from Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) 2011 showed tobacco smoking prevalence among women age >15 years was 2.7%. The 4.5% prevalence in 2011 pointed out by the reviewer is the prevalence of tobacco use (both smoke and smokeless).

In the introduction we have added the increasing prevalence of smoking among girls age 13-15 years between 2007 and 2014 from the Global Youth Tobacco Survey (p4, line 16-18)

5. On page 5 row 12: It had better to explain the exact time duration which tobacco ads are allowed on TV as follows: "allowing tobacco commercials to remain on television between 9.30pm and 5.00 am" This will clarify the uncertainty about timing of tobacco ads on TV.

Response:
We inserted the exact time duration of television broadcasting as suggested (p5, line 4-5)
6. On page 6 row 24, in the paragraph before "METHOD" title, it had better to explain that what kind of media (visual or print) was evaluated for this study. The term "News media" does not clear about that. Since this is "Aim" sentences, I believe it should be mentioned in here.
Response:
We add "print and online" news media (p6, line 1-2)
7. On page 8 row 56, "TI" should be explained as the first mentioned place.
Response:
We provide the abbreviation of TI in the first mentioned place (p9, line 34)

8. On page 8 Table 1: If the subtitles "support categories" (before row 25) and "opposed categories" (before row 52) insert the table, the table will be easier to understand.
Response:
We inserted subtitle "in support categories" and "Opposed categories to table 1 (p8, line 12 and p9, line 1)

## VERSION 3 – REVIEW

| REVIEWER | K. Michael Cummings<br>Medical University of South Carolina<br><br>I serve as a paid expert witness in litigation against cigarette manufacturers. |
|---|---|
| REVIEW RETURNED | 05-Jul-2017 |

| GENERAL COMMENTS | The authors have done a nice job responding to reviewer comments. The revisions made are appropriate and have improved the paper. I have no additional comments to add at this time. |
|---|---|

| REVIEWER | Bekir KAPLAN<br>Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health<br>Institute for Global Tobacco Control |
|---|---|
| **REVIEW RETURNED** | 05-Jul-2017 |

| **GENERAL COMMENTS** | Thank you for updating the manuscript |
|---|---|