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40170 Shah Alam,
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Dear Editor-in-chief,

Thank you very much for your comments. We are thankful to the editors and reviewers for their time and insightful comments on our manuscript. We have amended their comments and suggestions and hope to submit a revised version of the manuscript for further consideration in the journal. Changes in the initial version of the manuscript are either highlighted for added sentences or strikethrough for deleted sentences in the revised version. Below, we also include a point-by-point feedback explaining how we have addressed each of the editors or reviewers’ comments. We look forward to the outcome of your assessment.

On behalf of the co-authors

Sincerely,

Dr Halizah binti Mat Rifin

Medical Officer

Institute for Public Health,

National Institute of Health,

Ministry of Health Malaysia
Reviewer 1 Comment Authors response

1. Research question seems irrelevant:

Our objectives are to determine the impact of kiddie pack on initiation of smoking, urge/tendency to buy cigarettes, attempt to reduce cigarette consumption and prevalence of smoking using kiddie pack in the general population. Therefore, we would like to look at the association between the kiddie pack and the above objectives. We think our objectives are relevant since to our knowledge there are no systematic reviews being conducted in this area.

2. Additional keywords on criteria 3 “intend,” ”desire”, “consumption”.

Thank you for the suggestion. We agreed with the reviewer comments and have amended the additional keywords and have incorporated into our search method.

3. Consider studies published in Malay and other languages:

Thank you for your suggestions. We agreed with the suggestion and will include any studies deemed appropriate in Malay language and other language.

4. How to evaluate tobacco industry influence on the primary studies:

We will look into full paper and check for a sponsorship and the conflict of interest, whether the research is being sponsored by a tobacco company or it is a researcher initiation. If the research being sponsored by a tobacco company, we will consider the bias on the study and will state in a specific column that the research is sponsored by a tobacco company.

5. A Narrative synthesis should focus more on interpretive critical reflection on the topic:

We agreed and we have amended in the protocol according to the suggestion.

Reviewer 2 Comment Authors response

1. Keep prevalence of smoking globally or internationally:

Thank you for your suggestion. We agreed and we have amended accordingly in the protocol.

2. Consider studies published in Malay and other languages:

Thank you for your suggestion. We agreed with the suggestion and will include any studies deemed appropriate in Malay language and other languages.
3. To consider RCT in the research question:

Thank you for your suggestions we agreed and we have included all study design (randomized controlled trials, quasi experimental and experimental studies, observational cross sectional and cohort studies)-as stated in line 144-146 as our inclusion criteria.

4. Whether the screening that will be done by 4 independent pairs of reviewer will be in duplicate:

Thank you for your concern. We have amended the reviewer to 2 pairs of authors. The title abstract search will be screened for duplication before assigning to the 2 pairs of reviewers. They will independently screen the title abstract and the discrepancies will be resolved through discussion among all authors.

5. To consider Cochrane risk of bias tools RoB 2 or ROBIN:

Thank you and we will include Cochrane risk of bias tools RoB2 or ROBIN if we could find all the possible RCTs.