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Reviewer’s report:

Major Essential revisions
1. Results in abstract are not clear...states 14.9% current users and 12.9% reported being screened which suggests only 2% were not. Having read the results I can see that 88% were not screened so need to make that clear in the abstract.
2. What was the participation rate?
3. Were care providers were blinded to the research and was anything done to reduce the risk of contamination?

Minor discretionary revisions
1. Clarify the research question
2. Include the screening rates from previous studies in background (referenced but not cited)
3. Discuss limitations of this study, including high rates of misclassification by self report.
4. Alot of results are reported about associations with smoking/types of tobacco use etc...which are not in the original question. ?adjust question or reduce descriptive stats. If you include can you describe how consistent these are with the national stats? This would give an indication how representative your sample is.
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