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Reviewer’s report:

On my opinion the paper could be interesting but there is no integration between Title-abstract-paper. Authors should reconsider to analyse every section following the CONSORT schema.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   The question posed by the authors is not well defined, as in the title, abstract and paper is different (the reader cannot exactly specifically if the study presents two or three arms to evaluate).

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Methods are not correctly described as the interventions should be more precisely described. The main outcome is not clearly defined as in the Methods is considered the continued abstinence rate and in the results (paper and abstract) they give us the point-abstinence rate.

As a clinical trial they should specify the sample size estimation, the randomization (sequence generation, allocation concealment, implementation), blinding (if needed). Remember that randomization should be afterwards of signed consent, never before.

About the flow chart is not correctly described, as it should specify for each group report the numbers of participants randomly assigned, receiving intended treatment, completing the study protocol, and analyzed for the primary outcome, as well as to describe protocol deviations from study as planned, together with reasons.

3. Are the data sound? Not exactly, data is too small to create a multivariate analysis.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? The manuscript does not adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition, so authors could review it following the CONSORT checklist. They should present data analysis by protocol and by intention to treat.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? The discussion and conclusions are not correctly based on the results, as they present a lot of follow-up population, so the representativity of the results is very limited.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Limitations are not clearly stated,
they should specify them into the discussion section.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Authors do not acknowledge any work upon which they are building.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Not appropriate as discussed before. Title should specify how participants were allocated to interventions.

9. Is the writing acceptable? Not appropriate.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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