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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr Giuseppe Gorini

Thank you for your e-mail including the comments on our manuscript entitled “Sports activity and combined use of snus and cigarette smoking among young males in Finland in 1999-2010”

We thank the reviewer for constructive criticism and comments. We have revised the manuscript according to the reviewer’s suggestions in blue font. Our point-by-point responses below are given in italics in the same order as the suggestions were given in your letter.

We hope that the revision made and arguments given are satisfactory and that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in the BMC Public Health.

We look forward to hearing from you soon and are willing to discuss our paper further whenever needed.

Yours sincerely,

Ville Mattila, MD, PhD
Our point-by-point responses below are given by *italics* in the same order as the suggestions were given in the comment letter.

Comments from editorial office:

The article is improved a lot. However, one reviewer asked for additional comments. I suggest to answer to reviewer dr. Tord Finne F Vedoy, and to prepare a new version according to Tord's suggestions.

*We have now edited the manuscript as suggested.*
Reviewer's report
Title: Sports activity and combined use of snus and cigarette smoking among young males in Finland in 1999-2010
Version: 2 Date: 25 January 2012
Reviewer: Francois Marclay

Reviewer's report:
The authors have given satisfying answers to all my comments and modified the manuscript accordingly. Therefore, no supplementary revisions are needed before publication in my opinion. The results presented in this paper are of great interest in the field of smokeless tobacco use and will be an interesting addition to the global knowledge on this phenomenon.

Thank you very much!

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.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.
Reviewer's report

Title: Sports activity and combined use of snus and cigarette smoking among young males in Finland in 1999-2010

Version: 2 Date: 7 February 2012

Reviewer: Tord Finne F Vedøy

Reviewer's report:

The second version of the paper is much improved and it seems that we to a great extent agree on the comments given on the first version. However, I have some comments that I hope the authors will consider implementing in the third version.

DR=Discretionary Revisions
MER=Minor Essential Revisions
MCR=Major Compulsory Revisions

1. MER: General comment: The authors should be consistent when using the concept “sports activity”. In the current version I also encountered the concepts “sports training” (pp. 2, 8, 10 and 19) and “sports participation” (pp. 11 and 21). Also, the concept is sometimes expressed in singular “sport activity” (pp. 2 and 12) and plural “sport activities” (pp. 8 and 11).

   The manuscript has now been carefully checked and edited as suggested.

2. MER: Page 8: Under “Subjects and methods” the authors refer to the models in the first stage of analysis as bivariate. This might be misleading as both age and one other independent variable were included as independent variables in the models (if understood correctly).

   We have removed the word "bivariate".

3. MER: Page 8: The 5th sentence suggests that "urbanization" was not part of "sociodemographic status". As reported on page 8, "urbanization" was part of "sociodemographic status" and the word "urbanization" should be deleted.

   Deleted as suggested.

4. MER: Page 8: 6th sentence: The authors should indicate which differences were tested. Differences in tobacco use prevalences at different points in time?

   Edited as suggested.

5. DR: Page 8: The first paragraph should be divided in 2 after 3rd sentence (New paragraph starts with "Next...").

   Edited as suggested.

6. DR: Page 8: The above mentioned comments suggest that the section titled “Statistical analysis” may benefit from some textual revision.

   We have now conducted some revision (see above).

6. MCR: Under “Results” and “Discussion” the authors state that “aerobic sport activities […] were not significantly associated with snus use, cigarette smoking, or dual use compared to those not engaged in aerobic sport activities”. As far as I can see from table 2, several of these activities were significantly negatively associated with tobacco use: walking, swimming, cycling and skiing in the case of snus use; running, cycling and skiing in the case of smoking; walking, running, cycling and skiing in the case of dual use. In all cases the ORs are below 1 and
the 95% CIs does not include 1 (If I have understood the table correctly).

The authors agree. We have now edited this incorrect sentence.

7. DR: Model fit statistics may be included in the text. For example: “For all
models Nagelkerke R2 varied from 0.039 - 0.139…”, or they could be included in
table 2. NOTE: the test-statistic is written Nagelkerke, not Nagelkerge.

We have added sentence suggested in the text (statistical analysis –section). We
now use "Nagelkerke" consistently. If the editor suggest table 3 can be pub
lished as an additional material.

8. MER: Page 10, last sentence: use the expression "were controlled for" instead
of "were adjusted in the ..."

Edited as suggested.

9. MER: Page 12, 2nd sentence: Does "lower cigarette smoking" mean "lower
smoking prevalence"?

We have edited the sentence and now state "lower odds ratios".

10. DR: Page 12, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: "intake" may be changed to
"uptake".

Changed as suggested.

11. MER: Page 13, 3rd paragraph: The authors should discuss the possibility and
and implication of reverse causality between smoking status and sports activities.

Thank you for this comment. We have now added discussion as suggested.

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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