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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This is a well-written paper and the authors provide an intriguing approach to proactive recruitment beyond the clinic. I have no major compulsory revisions.

Minor Essential Revisions

The authors do a nice job of addressing the low response rate. Given that 890 schools were contacted and 35,000 study invitations sent, leading 512 smokers receiving cessation support - it would be useful if the authors also addressed the cost-effectiveness of this proactive recruitment approach. I'm ass

Discretionary Revisions

1. p7, Procedure. The authors mention that parents and children were asked to complete a questionnaire. The Results and Discussion do not mention the child questionnaire. Could the authors either remove children from the Methods or explain that the data were collected, but not relevant to this paper?

2. p7, Procedure. The authors state that participants were randomly assigned to conditions. The next sentence states that the participants were stratified. Did the authors use stratified, random assignment? Or are the authors referring to the information in Table 1?

3. p9, How did participants recall of of the number of counseling calls received compare to the actual number administered? If they differed, did this discrepancy relate to any of the outcome variables?

4. Although quit rates were not the focus of this paper, I would be interested in knowing the 3 month quit rates for both groups.

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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