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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Manuscript title: The authors should consider indicating the place of study in the title. If possible, it is also recommended to indicate the study design in the title (and/or in the abstract).

2. Abstract: The authors explain that they calculated the “odds” in the Methods section. However, they do not show the results of odds; rather they show the results of odds ratios. Please clarify.

3. Abstract: In the abstract, the authors should clearly explain that both the Townsend score and the Mosaic are area-level measures of socioeconomic status.

4. METHODS, Data source: Did the authors assess the smoking status at the baseline of this study? Please clarify. In addition, is the information about changes of smoking behavior during the two-year period available?

5. METHODS: Please explain more clearly the differences between the Townsend score and the Mosaic. In addition, I would suggest explaining the measures separately by exposure (i.e., socioeconomic status), outcome (i.e., access to smoking cessation intervention), and covariates in order to enhance readability.

6. METHODS, analyses: The authors explain that they accounted for the clustering of patients within practices. How did they account for this? Did they use GEE?

7. METHODS, analyses: As shown in Tables 1-3, the prevalence of receiving advice is relatively high (approximately 50%). In this case, (prevalence) odds ratio and prevalence ratio will be very discrepant. The authors need to consider addressing this issue, providing the rationale of their analytic approach. Or, they should at least mention this issue in the text.

8. METHODS, analyses: The authors used the group and type with the lowest prevalence of receiving advice and prescribing as the reference in the analyses. Although this approach seems appropriate, I would suggest discussing the findings of socioeconomic variations, by comparing them with overall prevalence (i.e., 53.1% of advice receiving and 16.5% of prescriptions).

9. METHODS, analyses: I suggest moving the second paragraph of this section
to the Mosaic section.

10. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS: In the third paragraph, the authors explain the results of the analyses by prescription. The authors should explain the results of these analyses in the Results section.

11. I suggest showing a brief summary of previous studies in the field of public health that used the Mosaic classification. By so doing, the authors may show its utility or validity in public health planning.

12. Throughout the manuscript, the authors should consider making stronger connections with the previous literature. For example, when the authors discuss the link between socioeconomic status and smoking cessation, they should consider mentioning a recent review about socioeconomic status and smoking [1]. They may also mention a previous review about the effectiveness of workplace smoking cessation programs in the concluding paragraph [2].

13. Presumably, this article is an extension of a previous paper published in BMC Public Health [3]. If this is the case, the authors should explicitly explain what has been found and what this paper adds, by citing this paper.

Minor Essential Revisions

14. Abstract: The authors do not spell out “OR” and “CI.”

15. METHODS, analyses: Please indicate the significance level, by specifying if it is two-sided or one-sided test.

16. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS: In the fifth paragraph, perhaps change “prevalence of advice recording” to “prevalence of advice receiving” or “prevalence of receiving advice.”

17. I could not find the accompanying supplementary material, which shows the results for all 61 Mosaic types.

18. Throughout the manuscript, reference numbers in the text must be inserted before punctuation.

19. References: The style of references should be modified following the instructions to authors of the Journal.

20. Reference #8: Please correct the journal name.

21. Tables 1 to 3: Please show the place and year of study at the end of titles. Also, please show the abbreviations in the footnotes.

Discretionary Revisions

22. Manuscript title: It would be helpful if the authors indicate that the present study uses area-based measure of socioeconomic status in the title.
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