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Reviewer's report:

After the first revision session the article has been greatly improved by the authors. Notwithstanding the good progress of the work, the manuscript in my opinion continues to present some important lacunas:

1. The perceived harm of cigarette smoking: in the method, results and discussion sessions continue to be unclear what actually the authors wanted to assess and how they collected this information and analysed the results. It is not clear if the authors want to measure the knowledge (from the results: Of the participants, 18.2% knew the harm of cigarette smoking from label A. Among them, 16.5% (14/85) participants knew the relationship of cigarette smoking and respiratory diseases, including lung cancer, and 16.5%, and 3.5% respectively mentioned cancer and cardiovascular......) or the awareness and perception of the harm of smoking (see discussion, line 5, 6 of the second paragraph). This point needs to be very clear considering it represents a central point of the investigation as well as the discussion needs to be more exhaustive on the achieved outcomes.

Specifically, the differences between the results achieved for label A and B should be more widely discussed.

2. Although it is true that warning labels can be an important source of information regarding health risks not only for smokers but also for non-smokers I continue to think that the opinion of non smokers can be predictable and not relevant. Furthermore it is not easy for the readers to understand what the authors mean with the “impact of quitting” in non-Smokers. Also this point should be better accounted in the discussion.

3. In my opinion the meaning of the least or the most impact on cigarette giving or impact of is still unclear and not adequately discussed.
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