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Reviewer's report:

**TITLE**
Queer Quit: A pilot study of a smoking cessation programme tailored to gay men

The authors conducted a pilot study of a modified version of a British smoking intervention programme tailored for gay men in Switzerland. Point prevalence smoking abstinence at six months following attendance of the programme was assessed as outcome. Seventy gay smokers attended seven weekly sessions in groups taught by gay facilitators. Integral components of the intervention were discussing nicotine replacement therapy, performing carbon monoxide tests and forming ‘quit teams’. Seven-day point prevalence smoking abstinence, mental and physical health and drug use were assessed at baseline, in session 7 and at six-month follow-up. Point prevalence abstinence significantly increased from baseline to the follow-up (p = .00). At six months, 20 participants (28.6%) reported smoking abstinence over the previous 7 days. Increase in mental health between baseline and the six-month follow-up (p = .00) was observed. Participants who dropped out during the programme or were lost to follow-up smoked more cigarettes and were more nicotine dependent than the participants that were retained (p # .05). The authors concluded that his smoking cessation programme for gay men produced rates of point prevalence abstinence similar to interventions for non-gay groups.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The authors just mention that the participants were given a letter for physician so that a medication prescription could be done. The authors should explain more explicitly how many participants actually received NRT or other medication and how much they used it to assist cessation.

How did the authors assess alcohol consumption and changes in it?

**Minor Essential Revisions**

**RESULTS**
In the following sentence there are two errors. First, ‘measurement effect’ should be called ‘time effect’ and p=.00 should be marked as p<.001.

“According to the GEE analyses, “measurement point” had a significant impact on abstinence rates (OR 2.01, CI 1.60 - 2.52, p = .00).”
Discretionary Revisions
None

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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