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Reviewer’s report:

Authors try to update the evidence synthesis regarding the role of menthol in initiation, dependence and cessation of cigarette smoking. Although the authors have been quite successful in achieving their objective, there is some point that must be explained in much more detail than the one made.

In particular, the methods section should be developed somewhat more. Who made the selection? (Who read the abstracts?), Who was in charge of quality control? (If there was one), what did it consist of?

On the other hand, it is not clear why, of the 131 articles selected for full text review, only included in the systematic review 82. Apparently they were not relevant to the objective pursued (principle of results section, line 58), but it is not explained. Please, detail it. They should also explain, briefly, the results of those 49 articles (perhaps in the discussion section), just in case the relevance of these, was indirect (i.e. via the included articles).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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