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Author’s response to reviews:

The editor

BMC Systematic Reviews

19th May 2017

Dear editor,

Thank you for reviewing our attached manuscript entitled “Evidence for a comprehensive approach to Aboriginal tobacco control to maintain the decline in smoking: an overview of reviews among Indigenous peoples” for consideration in your journal.
We thank the reviewer’s for their final minor comment and have responded to this in the attached document, with changes to the manuscript highlighted in bold, and as tracked changes within the actual manuscript. We feel these have improved the manuscript and are resubmitting this for your consideration.

We can confirm that we have not submitted or published this manuscript elsewhere. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries on c.chamberlain@latrobe.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Chamberlain, on behalf of the authorship team

Responses to reviewer report

Reviewer #1:

1. Thank you for the responses to the reviewer comments. The changes have markedly improved the manuscript. This was a huge undertaking of work (the review and the manuscript writing) for an important topic. I think that the Tables/Figures and Additional Files help to communicate the findings succinctly, when reading through the results is time-consuming. I think that the flow of the manuscript is good, there are just a few minor language/editing corrections to be made (Discussion section, p 46 for example), usually around modifications related to reviewer comments. These sentence flow changes are primarily in the Discussion and Introduction.

We thank reviewer 1 for the positive and constructive feedback, and we have made the recommended language/editing corrections in the Introduction and Discussion as follows:

P5 L3: Worldwide, 5.4 million people die every year due to tobacco use, and this is expected to rise to 8 million over the next 30 years [1].

P5 L23: These disparities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people’s are similar…

P6 L4: In Australia, the average life expectancy of Indigenous people born in 2010–2012 is estimated approximately to be 10.6 years lower than…

P7 L2: This overview has been conducted under the auspices of the Australian Prevention Partnership Centre...

P46 L6: While tThe suggestions and conclusions of the majority of reviewers in our overview are also consistent with those reported in reviews in the general population [51-54].
To deal with this, we have assessed where domains appeared to be looked for, and we have also specified where reviewer suggestions were based on reported evidence or if it was unclear.

A second limitation is that studies that are more recent studies may not yet be included in reviews.

However, there is some debate about the role of ‘strengths-based’ versus negative narrative messages, and how these messages are processed [61]. Personalised messages, which arouse strong emotions, are likely to be more effective.

The Extended Parallel Process Model proposes a mechanism where some evidence suggests high ‘perceptions of risk’ (elicited by strong negative messages) coupled with low levels of ‘self-efficacy’ may be associated with avoidance behaviour, [43, 64]. Suggested by one reviewer in this overview suggests this could be as a possible factor affecting low rates of smoking cessation among Indigenous women [25], highlighting the importance of understanding message processing.