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Ref: your mail Re: 1566326679108104. Mortality attributable to tobacco: Review of different methods

Sir,

Please find enclosed the revised manuscript now titled “Mortality attributable to tobacco: Review of different methods”.

We highly appreciate these comments for their usefulness in helping us make the content of the article more precise and clearer. Following are the detailed responses to these comments.

**Editor's comment:**
Please take into account the guidelines for systematic reviews: see [www.prisma-statement.org](http://www.prisma-statement.org)

*R. Guidelines were taken into account*

**Review: Edwin Pelfrene, PhD**

**I. Minor Essential Revisions**
They all apply to some language details:
1. Introduction, paragraph 4 (§4): ... Unless urgent action is taken, tobacco's annual death will rise ... -> death toll will rise ...
   
   *R. Done*

2. Materials and methods, §1: Search terms were used, including ... , "smoking" and the key words "tobacco". -> ..., "smoking", in combination with the key word "tobacco".
   
   *R. Done*

3. Materials and methods, §1, last sentence: ... in Canada USA and Portugal -> in Canada, USA and Portugal.
   
   *R. Done*
4. Materials and methods, §2, first sentence: The main .. the use of modelization to estimate ... -> the use of modelling to estimate ... (in American English also 'modeling' is used, as I may learn from a dictionary).
R. Done

5. Materials and methods, §2, last sentence: No restriction was taking into account ... -> was taken into account
R. Done

6. Materials and methods, §3, first sentence: A total of 186 articles were found, ...since they used modelization to estimate -> modelling/modelling methods
R. Done

7. Materials and methods, §3, last sentence: As a result of this first review, a further 12 articles ... were included in the analysis. -> As a result, 12 articles published between 1998 and 2005 were included in the analysis.
R. Done

8. Materials and methods, §3, first sentence: The following information's ... -> The following items ...
R. Done

9. Results and discussion, Type of models and used methods, §1: ... The applied methodology ... : ... -> ... : prevalence-based analysis in cohort studies (SAMMEC method), prevalence-based analysis in case-control studies, smoking impact ratio method.
R. Done

10. Results and discussion, Type of models and used methods, § at the end of the section: The second step of this process consists of computing ..., by age group and sex, as per the CPS II. -> as per the CPS
R. Done

11. Results and discussion, Type of models and used methods, last §: The last step in this procedure would involve applyig -> applying
12. Results and discussion, Smoking attributable mortality, §2. .. and 3% of total mortality in women (380000 deaths). -> (380 000 deaths).
R. Done

13. Discussion, §3, first sentence: The first limitation affecting ... stems from the use of different methodological approach -> stems from the use of a different ...
R. Done

14. Discussion, §4, middle: In Israel, ... using a lagged approach - which took into account .. -> which
R. Done

15. Discussion, §4, near the end: In Israel, ... of 50% on the SAMMMEC categories [21]. The opposite occurs .. -> ... [21]. The opposite ...
R. Done

16. References, Ref1: the title is not in bold case? Is it in any way different from the other references?
R. Done

17. References, Ref10: Pruss-Ustun can be dropped.
R. Done

18. References, Ref24: Wen C P, Tai S P, ... -> Wen CP, Tai SP, ...
R. Done

19. Table 1: the final point in the title of the table can be dropped.
R. Done

20. Table 3: Mal/Femal -> Male/Female
R. Done
II. Discretionary Revisions

1. Introduction, §2:

"Among risk factors for non-communicable diseases, tobacco is enemy number one (WHO, 2000). It is the most important established cause of cancer but also responsible for cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases." ->

To be "the most important established cause" is quite a general and bold statement, which might be difficult to prove. An alternative could be: It is a widely established cause of cancer, and moreover, also responsible for cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. I leave it to the authors to consider the point raised.

R. Done

2. Results and Discussion,

Type of models and used methods, i. Prevalence-based analysis in cohort studies (SAMM EC), §1, middle: "The first step is selecting the most relevant smoking related pathologies and for which reliable data existed." Alternative to consider ->

"The first step consists in selecting the most relevant smoking related pathologies for which reliable data are available."

R. Done

3. Results and Discussion,

Type of models and used methods, i. Prevalence-based analysis in cohort studies (SAMM EC), §1, last sentence: "The second step was establishing the quantitative relationship between smoking and the pathologies in question. "Alternative ->

"The second step establishes the quantitative relationship between smoking and the selected pathologies."

R. Done

4. Discussion, §3, middle:

"... All these factors influence the results of the attributable mortality. The second limitation resides in the absence ..." To consider -> "... All these factors influence the results of the attributable mortality. The second limitation resides in the absence ..." R. Done
5. Discussion, §4, middle:

"Knowing current smoking prevalence could be a great help when it comes to predicting future mortality, but not present." To consider -> "Knowing current smoking prevalence could be a great help when it comes to predicting future mortality, it might fail however with respect to the present mortality.

R. Done

6. Finally, in the cover letter, an alternative title was suggested: “Smoking-attributable mortality in Morocco: Results of a prevalence-based study in Casablanca” I have some difficulties to see the relationship with the article presented. The title "Mortality attributable to tobacco: Review of different methods” is definitely more valid.

R. It was a mistake, the title is “Mortality attributable to tobacco: Review of different methods”

**Reviewer: Katrien Vanthomme**

Major: In the cover letter the authors state the following: Please find enclosed the revised manuscript now titled “Smoking-attributable mortality in Morocco: Results of a prevalence-based study in Casablanca”

The manuscript I received is the same as the previous one, i.e. "Mortality attributable to tobacco: Review of different methods". I would like to have this clarified

R. It was a mistake, a title is “Mortality attributable to tobacco: Review of different methods”.