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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Abstract
1.1 Results
1.1.1 Quartiles are reported together with the median and NOT the SD.
1.1.2 Report rates in the 3rd sentence

2. Methods
2.1 Measures and analysis
2.1.1 The questions that were used to assess adolescents' perception are exactly the same ones that were used in the GYTS. I believe the GYTS data was robust enough to have been used in the current study. The current study conducted an analysis of the “other” category using qualitative analysis methods, and yet the source of data was a survey “quantitative”. Post coding of the responses in the “other” category could have been appropriate; and the responses quantified! The fact that there are other responses that are recorded in the “other” category, such data are not qualitative, they still remain quantitative.

3. Results
3.1 Paragraph 1, last sentence – Report all p values to 1 decimal place, and again the SD is not an appropriate measure of variation to report together with the median.
3.2 Tobacco use by students – report a 95% confidence interval for the odds ratio (OR=2.1)
3.3 Adolescents' perceptions about male and female smokers
3.3.1 Subject the comparisons in the rest of the paragraph to statistical tests.
3.3.2 Other correlates – it is not statistically correct to say what is in the first 3 sentences of the first paragraph when the associations were not statistically significant.

4. Tables
4.1 Table 1 – stratify the table by sex of the respondent, and report p values.
Report the overall percents and not average percents.

Minor Essential Revisions

5. The title does not only cover the women alone.
5.1 Suggest the title be changed to: “Adolescents’ perceptions about smokers in Karnataka, India”

6. Background
6.1 Paragraph 4: The first sentence is not a good enough reason for doing the current study. A secondary analysis of the GYTS data could have been conducted.

6.1.2 Correlates of adolescents’ perceptions about smokers – move paragraph 1 to the Discussion section. Similarly, move the last sentences in the following two paragraphs to the Discussion section.

7. Discussion – the GYTS Karnataka factsheet should have data with which the results of the current study could be compared with.

7.1 table 3 – clearly indicate the referent category for the odds ratios. It is not necessary to report p values when you have 95% confidence intervals. Correct the footnote “Fischer-exact test” to Fisher exact test”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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