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Reviewer’s report:

Review – Improving smoking cessation support for pregnant and postpartum women: an exploratory study.

These are all discretionary revisions

1. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

• Methods adequately described. Interesting option for women to be interviewed in friendship pairs.
• However no explanation was given for why the interviews took place over a 16 month period.

2. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

• yes. This health services research makes the important observation that the current cessation system is not equipped to adequately reduce smoking among pregnant and postpartum women – pulling the responsibility for change from women alone, to systemic deficiencies and inadequacies. This is a critical contribution.
• In some ways i felt the points of made in the conclusion were so balanced that they bordered on being tame in the light of the inadequacy of supports.

3. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

• acknowledgement is adequate, and evident from the references, however there is more updated version of the Expecting to Quit resource (reference 29) available at www.expectingtoquit.ca Greaves, L., Poole, N., Okoli, C. T. C., Hemsing, N., Qu, A., Bialystok, L., et al. (2011). Expecting to Quit: A best practices review of smoking cessation interventions for pregnant and postpartum girls and women (Second Edition). Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Centre of Excellence for Women’s Health and Health Canada. This version of the ETQ report makes the links between health inequities and tobacco and also points to service improvements which might have been referred to in the background section.

4. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
• yes – however a title such as Exposing the inadequacies of smoking cessation support for pregnant and postpartum women – might be more compelling

5. Is the writing acceptable?

• yes - the sorting into the 3 areas of policy, program and population (with subtitled points) works well - making 3 ‘p’s rather than using “contextual factors” as the 3rd area might stick with the reader more strongly.

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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