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Reviewer's report:

This review addresses an urgent public issue in Malaysia. Couple comments:

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.

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.

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

4. Tobacco industry has strong influence over studies on tobacco. How do you evaluate their influence on the primary studies included in your review?

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.
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