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Reviewer's report:

Comments to the authors, «predictors of smoking among Swedish adolescents»

This is a very good paper. Well-written and clear, and with interesting and informative results shedding light on predictors of smoking initiation among young adolescents. The introduction and results sections are particularly good. The aim of the study is well defined, the title and abstract convey the findings, the methods are appropriate and well described, and the data are sound. I have some concerns regarding the discussion, particularly the middle part of it, which I find to be somewhat unstructured and unfocused.

Discretionary Revisions

1) Abstract- Conclusion: The repetition of the results seems unnecessary as they are reported already in the abstract. Instead perhaps you should elaborate your three suggestions a little more (self-esteem, promotion of anti-smoking attitudes and avoid early snus initiation). For example also mention the importance of parents acting as role-models?

2) Methods – study population and procedures, section beginning with “No parents refused...” and Figure 1: I am unsure of the value of including the information about waves 2 and 3. If waves 2 and 3 are not mentioned, perhaps you could also remove figure 1?

3) Methods, Participants and non-responses: Same comment as before (2).

Minor essential revisions

4) Methods – study population and procedures, 3-5th line: The expression “educational level of the schools” a little confusing. The same applies to the statement “...covering both high and low parental educational levels...”. You should try to inform the reader more clearly that what is meant is the educational level of the parents.

5) Methods, Participants and non-responses, last sentence: You should say what these differences are (more boys lost etc.)

6) Methods, Questionnaire, last sentence: Clarify how you could test reliability already when the questionnaire was under construction.

7) Discussion, second paragraph, last sentence: I did not understand this sentence. Can you reformulate it?

8) Discussion, paragraph 3: Give the theory of planned behavior a less prominent
place in the paragraph, as this is the first time it is mentioned in the paper. Also, move the limitations (don’t know if intentions have varied) to the section were you discuss limitations. I also suggest that you move the implication (actions during first six school-years) further back, i.e. that you insert a new paragraph towards the end of the discussion, were various implications are discussed.

9) Discussion, paragraph 4: This paragraph concerns other research. Perhaps this could fit in an implication-section. As it is now I think it is too long, and not sufficiently tied to your findings.

10) Discussion, paragraph 5: Although interesting, I think this paragraph is too long, particularly as you have no information on parents’ smoking. The last sentence is an implication, and should be moved to implications.

11) Discussion, paragraph 6: Implications. Should be moved further back.

12) Paragraph 7: You state that your results are not consistent with Norwegian increased risk of dual use results. However, it is not clear to me if your group of smokers are exclusive smokers or not. If your smoker group include many dual users, perhaps the results are not so inconsistent after all. Also, the sentence “thus in both studies snus facilitated smoking” is unclear, and seems at odds with what you wrote in the sentence before. Which “both studies”? Does this the sentence imply that there are less of an inconsistency than you said earlier?

Minor issues not for publication:

Methods, Participants and non-responses, first sentence: Instead of “of these 649 participated in both the first and the fourth survey”, I suggest: “…of these 649 participated also in the fourth survey”.

Methods, questionnaire: Missing word in first sentence: focusing [on] self-rated health…

Results, 3rd sentence: Unnecessary “did” in the first half of this sentence.

Discussion, last half of second paragraph: typo: “relationship form” – should be “from”

Discussion, 5th paragraph, middle: “In this study we did not have excess..” – should be “access”

Discussion, 6th paragraph> Is there a word missing in the sentence “Other stakeholders in this respect are…. mainly focusing [on] sports?”

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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