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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper which examines homeless smokers in UK. The findings of this study suggested a need for the especial strategies for the vulnerability of smokers.

There are some problems in the current manuscript. I would like to provide the authors with the following specific comments, hoping that they can be used for improving the manuscript:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Comments on the Table
You explained Table 1 and 2. But, those tables didn’t be attached in this paper. Please attach Table 1 and 2.

2. Comments on the Methods
In the Data analysis, you explained that this data were analyzed by two researchers. Were both of two researchers harm reduction service providers as specialist nurses? It was a little hard to understand. You should explain your characteristics, such as your occupation.

In data analysis, how was division of roles performed between two researchers? Did two researchers analyze the data independently or jointly? You should explain the process of data analysis between two researchers.

In the third paragraph, you explained that “the following three main themes were identified for coding and are described and illustrated”. But those processes of analysis were not explained. Those processes were important as interpretation of the results. You should explain those processes in more concrete (coding, described and illustrated).

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Comments on the Background
In the first paragraph, you used abbreviation “NHS”. But the meaning of “NHS” was explained in the Methods (Setting & participants) and the last paragraph in the Results. You should explain meaning of the word at the first.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Comments on the Results
In the Results, you used four underlines. I did not understand why you used those underlines. Please explain those underlines.

2. Comments on the Discussion
In the Study limitation, you explain that “which did not indicate gender differences in the contents of the narrative”. Those results should be explained in the Results.

In the Lack of acknowledgement of health risks, you wrote that “Homeless people are well documented to have lower literacy levels than general population, with a third of one of the UK’s largest homeless service’s users having difficulty understanding what the read”. How much percentage of literacy in this study participant? This information helped readers understanding about Results and Discussion.
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