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Reviewer's report:

Specific comments and suggestions follow:
1) TITLE - "more evidence to support oral health promotion services targeted to smokers calling tobacco quitlines" - should be "to support the strategy of oral..." and should refer to the place (either "in Washington" or "in North America")
2) METHODS - page 7 "and had reported that they could read and write in English" - should be stated how many didn't answer the criteria
3) METHODS - the authors should show calculation of sample size
4) Results - p.9 paragraph 2: "Eighty-five percent of respondents had some or all of their natural teeth, but nearly half of dentate respondents had lost one or more teeth due to disease and approximately 15% had lost all of their natural teeth." - should be rephrased: the writing is confusing
5) RESULTS - p. 9 paragraph 3 "Oral health Self-care" - should state that it refers only to the dentate respondents.
6) RESULTS - p. 10 paragraph 2 "were similar across participants" - should show a statistical analysis
7) DISCUSSION - while the results showed the participants from the commercial quitlines to be "They were also less interested in oral health promotion services than were callers to the state quitline program, defined as interest in learning how to improve their oral health (OR = 0.57, 95% CI 0.45-0.72; p < .001), interest in talking with a quitline counselor (OR = 0.44, 95% CI 0.35-0.56; p < .001), or interest in receiving oral health promotion information by mail or Internet (OR = 0.68, 95% CI 0.52- 0.88; p = 0.003)." there is no reference to there findings in the discussion.
8) TABLE 2 - calculation is problematic - total 455, dentate participants 384 - should be edentulous 71 - but in the table = 68
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