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To the Editor,

**MS: 1708016998822896**

Chronic hepatitis B prevalence among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians since universal vaccination: a systematic review and meta-analysis.

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript.

Please find below point-by-point responses to the reviewer’s comments.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Graham
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Program
Kirby Institute
University of New South Wales
Sydney Australia
1. In the methods section, it is stated that the meta-analysis was conducted on two sub-groups, namely adults and pregnant women. However, the results shown (Fig 2 and 3) are quite unclear, because it seems at first from the text that those figures refer to the adults subgroup (it is stated 'people'), whereas the title of the Fig 2 is "Adults before 2000" and Fig 3 is "Pregnant women since 2000"; aren’t two figures missing? (presumably, adults since 2000 and pregnant women before 2000?). Please clarify

The authors could not produce the forest plots for adults since 2000 because there was only two studies of adults conducted since 2000 and both these studies only included Indigenous adults with no non-Indigenous comparison group. We could not produce the forest plots of pregnant women before 2000 as there is only one study and this study only included Indigenous pregnant women with no non-Indigenous pregnant women included as a comparison group. We have changed the wording slightly in the manuscript to highlight that the forest plots are a combined adults/pregnant women category (highlighted in red).

2. Second, an interesting flow diagram of included studies has been added, but it may be a bit more detailed and clearer (e.g. arrows 'going out' for excluded studies; see Toy et al. BMC Infectious Diseases 2011, 11:337 as an example).

The authors have modified the flow diagram using the provided example to provide more detail and clearly describe the studies that were included and excluded and why.