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Reviewer's report:

General comments:
1. Are the overall findings cut-off dependent? Have you considered a more extreme cut-off level to define “strong support” among smokers?

2. You have acknowledged potential selection bias in the study, and have presumed that the adjustment for various socio-demographic characteristics would be sufficient. However, given that the response rate was only 56.4% of all eligible smokers, there is potential for residual bias. What is the distribution of socio-demographics between respondents and non-respondents? This comparison must be provided to gauge representativeness and the potential for bias.

3. You should comment on the generalizability of these findings to other countries.

Specific comments:
1. Abstract-Results: Why are the reported aORs selected from different models? Report from the same model for consistency.

2. Page 3, last paragraph: “We also aimed to undertake the most detailed multivariate analyses to date…” A useless claim, should delete sentence.

3. Page 9, Discussion, paragraph 1: “…many individuals supported some, but opposed other, types of smokefree area, i.e., fairly nuanced situation-specific attitudes.” It would be good to present the distribution of the responses to the 6 questions.

4. Page 11, Research and policy implications: “Our results suggest that improving knowledge of the SHS hazard might be a mechanism to raise smoker support…” Your data show that the majority of smokers are already knowledgeable of the harms of SHS (from Table 3, ranging from 77% to 80% for ‘Beliefs around SHS hazards’ even among weak supporters). Therefore your suggestion is not very convincing.

5. Table 1 could be better presented as a cumulative frequency plot.

6. Table 2: “Small area deprivation level was based on a New Zealand specific small area deprivation index.” An international audience might not be familiar with
this index, so further clarification or reference would be helpful.

7. Table 4: There is no indication of adjustment for age, sex and study design here. Are there adjustments included as in Tables 2 and 3?
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