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Reviewer's report about Effectiveness of intensive group and individual interventions against smoking in primary health care settings

On my opinion the paper has improved after first comments. The main topic is really relevant but methodologically as a Clinical trial is very poorly described accordingly to current guidelines (CONSORT), so I highly suggest that they should follow specifically these guidelines as an author help.

This is why I consider still a Major Revision of the paper before to be published. Nevertheless I would like to present basically some issues:

a) Sample size estimated much higher that the one observed, justify it and explain which main consequences could produce in the study results and the external validity of the study.

b) High number of missing data (higher than 90% per group, they are finally followed 10, 11 and 3 patients). Consider how can influence into the point and continuous abstinence rates as well as in the multivariate analysis. Being a Clinical trial, we could understand some missing data but not much. Explain the reason of recruitment and inclusion patients rates so different.

c) Attention table 3, because authors presented so many missing data, the effectiveness of different interventions could also be considered accordingly of remaining data (III: 6/11=54.5%; IGI: 6/10=60.0%; MI: 1/3=33.33%) and justify these data to the discussion section. Maybe considering some sensitivity analysis could try to justify it. CI 95% are so wide because of missing data, and non frequently data that they should justify it.

d) Statistical analysis section is confusing, so maybe redefine it, and specify posthoc analysis. More structured explanation.

e) Consider health care workers not trained about Smoking cessation therapy excluded from the study to randomise patients.

f) Explain which pharmacological therapies were considered, use it to adjust main results, and compare data sets.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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