Reviewer’s report

Title: Evidence for a comprehensive approach to Aboriginal tobacco control to maintain the decline in smoking: an overview of reviews among Indigenous peoples

Version: 0 Date: 13 Mar 2017

Reviewer: Brianne Wood

Reviewer's report:

Important topic and great opportunity for publication. Appreciate the applied direction of the work, but the paper was too long, and hard to read. The manuscript could benefit from some major editing (in-paper reference format, and the Background). Should be majorly shortened for consideration - perhaps consider presenting results in matrix format, by priority/principle? Or some sort of diagram? Doesn't seem like an academic paper at this point.

The comments like "based on expertise and limited Indigenous specific evidence" is important - how to distinguish what are appropriate conclusions? In the methods, authors discuss using AMSTAR, but then the quality isn't addressed at any other point in the results, other than descriptively in tables. Primary review quality (and its importance) should be clarified, and considered (perhaps as a way to reduce the data further). I think the limitation of grey literature from Australia only isn't a limitation as the results are going to be applied specifically in an Australian setting. This could be emphasized more. Why was protocol not registered with PROSPERO? Outcomes should be communicated as measurements, not only concepts. PRISMA checklist to be included?

P5. Line 49: "Tobacco smoking in high income countries has become a marker of social disadvantage, and is one of the principal causes of health inequality between rich and poor [13]." What does this mean? Please clarify.

Could use some major editing for clarity, and conciseness. References could be prepared more clearly.

Issue: why did you not register with PROSPERO?

P9, line44: What were the outcomes explicitly? What types of measures were you looking for? How do you define "smoking cessation"? Morbidity and mortality from…?

Should comment re: meta-analysis. Is this possible?

P12, line 8: avoiding double counting. What did you do about the double counting?/overlap?
P14, line 49: You say that one of your inclusion criteria is reviews with Indigenous participants from Australia, Canada, NZ and USA, but then in the Results, you say that 13 reviews included people in any country.?

P17, line 18: "These recommendations appeared to be based on reasoned arguments about effectiveness in other populations and rationale to improve acceptability and implementation of interventions, rather than clear evidence of effectiveness of these strategies among Indigenous peoples." This is an important statement.

P18, line 33: "For 51 references, we were unable to identify a program or project name from review level data, so could not determine if these included multiple reports for the same program or study". Could you look at the primary study references within each review?

P19, line 2: Did you include updates of reviews? Wouldn't this have been redundant?

P21, line 37: "looked for and found" studies is awkward. "Returned" studies?

Results section: How do you intend to consider the quality of the reviews when reporting the synthesized findings ("Priorities") across all reviews? No mention of quality.

Important topic, but became onerous to read. Main results could be presented in a table format and most of the narrative left in supplemental materials.
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