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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editors:

We have addressed the remaining reviewers' concerns, as reflected in our point-by-point response below. We believe that the manuscript is now ready for publication.

If you have any further questions about this manuscript or our response to reviewers, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Jim Thrasher

REVIEWER COMMENTS & AUTHORS' RESPONSES TO THEM

Reviewer 1 (Joachim Marti)

The authors adequately addressed the issues raised in my first report. I only have minor remarks: In the abstract (methods), the 2010 administration is mentioned, while at p.5 line 97, 2009 is mentioned.

RESPONSE: Thank you for pointing out our mistake. We have corrected the follow up survey administration year in the methods (page 5, line 97).

I would not use the term curvilinear in the abstract. The non-monotonic association between the probability to successfully quit and the frequency of buying singles may specifically reflect two types of consumers: the irregular singles consumer that make quit attempts and the regular singles consumers that do no have a clear intention to quit.

RESPONSE: We have changed the term from “curvilinear association” to “non-monotonic association” in the abstract (page 2, line 40)

Reviewer 2 (Hana Ross)
The results now show that “The odds of being quit was only statistically significant when comparing those who had not bought singles to reduce consumption with those who had done so on a more irregular basis (AOR=2.30; 95% CI 1.19, 4.45),…..” How many respondents are in this category? My rough calculation is that about 13 – 14 smokers. It is reasonable to base your conclusion using data from such a small sample?

RESPONSE: Out of 138 people who bought singles irregularly, there were 37 who were quit at follow up. The distribution for the other categories was 129/868 quitters among people who never bought singles, and 30/191 of those who bought singles more regularly. We feel comfortable with our conclusions about these categories of respondents, especially as we interpret these results with caution, due to the non-monotonic nature of the association. We have left the surrounding text as it was.

In an attempt to revise the paper, the authors inserted some cumbersome sentences such as: “Furthermore, non-statistically significant results around the interactions between consumption intensity and singles consumption suggested that these relationships are not clarified when examining singles consumption only among people with lower levels of consumption intensity.” The paper would benefit from expressing some of these constructs in shorter, but clear sentences.

RESPONSE: We have reviewed the revised sentences and shortened a number of them by dividing sentences into two (page 3, line 54; page 8, line 176; page 10, 214-219), shortening them (page 11, lines 261-263), or both (page 3, 69-72)