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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your responsiveness to the revisions. It is a much better manuscript.

Minor Essential revisions

1. You comment in results on the fact that smokers don't think industry is sincere in educating smokers about cessation, but you do not comment on this anywhere else. I think it is an important point that FDA would have interest- either revise and include, or remove the data point.

2. You have two tables 3 in your report-the first table 3 has only one question- please remove that question from the table and only discuss it in the text. This will solve your problem.

3. You display a consistent slight bias in how you are reporting results- I wonder if you really want to consistently draw focus to many minority statements in so many circumstances. For instance, in table 4, where great majority of smokers say light cigarettes are not more healthy- you report that significant minority of smokers say they are more healthy- This is not semantics, but reflects changing perceptions, where most smokers today now recognize the point that these cigarettes are less healthy- that seems to be what you could emphasize or comment more upon- there are several other similar statements in the results/discussion- Another example is that you discuss the statistically significant difference between those who use menthol and those who do not about support for banning menthol, when the take home point is that the great majority of both groups do not support. A third example, you focus in the discussion a statement that a minority of smokers support banning cigarette sales in retail outlets, but the majority oppose such bans- that is the far more salient point really. Your results can help policy makers-such as FDA- decide where to move more quickly or perhaps more slowly-knowing where opposition to proposed policy options will be higher. By focusing attention on minority viewpoints as you do in multiple places, you dilute out these perhaps more important take home messages.

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.