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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes, but this response is subject to a methodological limitation: I am a specialist on tobacco cessation, not a specialist on data deposition standards.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, with one exception. I suggest some minor clarification in the discussion regarding the absence of correlation between "alcohol consumption" (as defined in this study) and the difficulty to quit smoking. More details below.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes, except on one point which can be easily improved.

   In this study, "alcohol consumption" was defined as "at least one alcohol drink the last seven days". Of course, that definition cannot be used to differentiate between "problem drinkers" from the other subjects. In fact, no less than 86% of men in the study were categorized as "drinkers". I believe that this classification could be confusing to many readers, when they read that the study found no relationship between "alcohol consumption" (i.e., as defined in this study) and difficulty to quit smoking.

Hence, I suggest to the authors to include some statement to warn the readers about the limitations concerning that particular result. The statement could be something as follows: "Other studies suggest that alcohol dependent individuals have more difficulty to quit smoking than drinkers without alcohol dependence. However, the methods of the present study did not allow to measure alcohol dependence."
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, except for what seems to be a minor slip with the reference software, resulting in one omission from the reference list:

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes, except the way the references were quoted in page 9, line 3. This seems to be more a software problem than a writing problem. See item 7 for the missing reference.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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