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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

***Please refer the attachment -(PERSONAL COVER) - RESPONSE TO DECISION LETTER***
1. The research question seems irrelevant. The question here in Malaysia is not about kiddie packs versus regular packs, but whether the ban on kiddie packs will boost illegal cigarette market, and whether the reintroduce of kiddie packs could reduce it. The (harmful) effects of kiddie packs compared to regular packs seem to be established already, as WHO and many countries have banned kiddie packs. Having a review on this is unlikely to help the discussion with tobacco manufacturers as they care more about the loss of revenue due to illegal cigarette market. What I suggest is a big change to the research question, and the authors should consult other reviewers and editor regarding their opinion on this, please.

--Authors response: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. Assuming that you continue with the current research question, then criteria 3 of the search strategy seems limited. Other keywords I could quickly think of include "intend", "desire", "consumption", etc.

----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. Since this addresses an important issue in Malaysia, should you also consider studies published in Malay and major languages in neighboring states?

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

4. Tobacco industry has strong influence over studies on tobacco. How do you evaluate their influence on the primary studies included in your review?
--- 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. I agree with using narrative synthesis to summarize the selected studies. However, the format in which your narrative synthesis is proposed is more like a meta-analysis. Instead, a narrative synthesis should focus more on interpretive critical reflection on the topic, not just summarizing data. "What is the effect" is less interesting here. More interesting is the 'why' and the context.

------ We agreed and we have amended in the protocol according to the suggestion. which stated in line 255 until line 273 (19_7_19 Protocol on kiddie packs and its impact on smoking.docx)-clean version

Reviewer 2 Comment:

1. Authors reported the prevalence of smoking in Malaysia. I would suggest keep this global or international since the research question is relevant globally. Similar later in the background - although this is an example for the need of this review in Malaysia but it is quite relevant to other countries.

------ Author response: Thank you for your suggestion. We agreed and we have amended accordingly in the protocol.- which stated in line 82 until line 84 (19_7_19 Protocol on kiddie packs and its impact on smoking.docx)-clean version

2. I would not restrict the language of publication to English language, specially to produce a relevant review for Malaysian context with regards to the prevalence of this phenomena.

------ Thank you for your suggestion. We agreed with the suggestion and will include any studies deem appropriate in Malay language and other languages. which stated in line 141 (19_7_19 Protocol on kiddie packs and its impact on smoking.docx)-clean version

3. I wonder if a randomised controlled trial is a possible study design for this question?
Thank you for your suggestions we agreed and we have included all RCTS, quasi control as our inclusion criteria. as stated in line 144-146(19_7_19 Protocol on kiddie packs and its impact on smoking.docx)-clean version

4. Authors reported that "Titles and/or abstracts of the original publications will be screened independently by four independent pairs of reviewers to exclude publications that does not meet the eligibility criteria." This need to be clarified as whether this screening will be in duplicate and why four not two?

---------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.- as stated in line 213-218(19_7_19 Protocol on kiddie packs and its impact on smoking.docx)-clean version

5. Authors reported that they will use QATSDD tool but I would suggest using Cochrane risk of bias tools RoB or ROBIN.

--------Thank you and we will include Cochrane risk of bias tools RoB or ROBIN if we could find all the RCTs. as stated in line 240-242(19_7_19 Protocol on kiddie packs and its impact on smoking.docx)-clean version