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Reviewer’s report:

General comments

* Overall well written and the article is easy to follow.

* Would suggest that you state the objectives of this article (protocol for 2 systematic reviews) as the beginning of the article. It's not clear that this article is a protocol until halfway through reading it.

* The first systematic reviews of various stop smoking interventions seem to be somewhat over ambitions. Key questions are broad and do not convey enough specificity to what exactly you will be looking for.

* A lot of emphasis is placed on behavioural therapies and the proposed subanalysis of behavioural change techniques (Key Question 1c) could be its own paper. Would consider writing a 3rd paper with this question only.

* Pharmacotherapies interventions are not given as much attention. Are you looking at the individual treatments, or are you going to group them all together?

* Except of a brief paragraph on alternative therapies in the background sections, nothing specific mentioned in method section.

* Will you be looking at synergistic/additive effects of combining different treatment together?

* The e-cigarette literature is fairly young and though more information is being added daily, the number of e-cigarette systematic reviews maybe limited and not very informative. An actual systematic review of recent publications would provide better insight on the benefit and harms of e-cigarettes to promote cessation of tobacco smoking among adults.

Specific comments

Abstract
* The Method section is too long and contains too many details. This subsection should be cut down.

* It is clear that two systematic reviews will be conducted: 1) various stop smoking interventions, 2) e-cigarettes. The methods described for the reviews are intermixed and it gets confusing what will be done for each review. It would be clearer if a separate method paragraph would be written for each review.

Background

* Overall the Background section is well written. It highlights the health and economic impact of smoking and the benefits of quitting. It also described the different smoking cessation therapies clearly.

* Many of the statistics referenced seem out of date (2012). Please replace with more up to date statistics.

* The word "prevalent" is over used in the Prevalence and Burden of Tobacco Smoking section. Please consider combining sentences and rewording slightly.

* Line 139: consider rewording "Stopping smoking reduces the risk…” to "Stopping to smoke reduces the risk…”.

* Line 147-148: Sentence on e-cigarette use out of place with tone of paragraph. Sentence should be on increase e-cigarette use to quit.

* Line 151: Would consider removing this sentence. Redundant when considering the information provided within the rest of the paragraph.

* Line 226: Sentence on St. John's Wort seems out of place. You are talking of its alternate use as an antidepressant and it's not clear that it is use as a smoking cessation aid.

Literature search

* Why is PubMed not one of the databases being searched?

Data mapping and overlap detection

* What will you do to address overlapping systematic reviews that have conflicting conclusion using the same data pool?

Discussion
* Would considering including 2-3 sentences on the importance of these reviews and the health and economic impact of their findings.

Tables and Figure

* Clear, easy to understand and follow.
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