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Author’s response to reviews:

We thank the editor and the reviewers for their great comments. We have carefully studied all of them and were able to incorporate almost all. We think the manuscript really improved. Below we explain how we revised the manuscript, largely following the structure of the comments.

Editor

• We thank the editor for the suggested reference. It is incorporated into the discussion.

Reviewer 1

• This reviewer requests more information, when available, about whether smokers in this study used smoking cessation assistance of any kind. We now present the retrospective question that asked respondents about the use of assistance and we present these data a separate paragraph. This is a great idea.

• The reviewer asks to refer to deal with an earlier finding that smokers who were looking for help themselves were more successful in quitting compared to those who were not looking for help. However, now we present the above results on smoking cessation assistance this matter seems less relevant: The assistance data show that almost 30% of the smokers in the control condition reported to have used some assistance over the past 13 months. This indicates that this control sample was also interested in quitting (which was also indicated by the measure of motivation), and it makes the argument that the higher percentages of abstinence in the Act are caused by the inertness of smokers in the control condition less strong.

• The age of starting to smoke is dealt with now.

• We restructured the results section now: The structure is much clearer now.

Reviewer 2

• We integrated all 10 comments of reviewer 2
Reviewer 3

• The first comment is about the term quasi-experimental; the reviewer thinks it is misleading. I understand what the reviewer means and we do not want pretend that the study was randomized. However, quasi-experimental is really an established term and much used research design and a quick search through the literature give tens of articles with this term in the title, and several books that handle about the quasi-experimental design. In addition, both other reviewers had no comment on the use of this term. That is why we did not change the use of this term but we do state now in the introduction explicitly that “…no randomization took place.”

• The reviewer also finds the term “intention-to-treat” misleading. Again, although we understand what the reviewer means we think that our use of the term is state-of-the-art: We follow the guidelines for smoking cessation research as published by West, Hajek, Stead and Stapleton (2005). Also, both other reviewer had no comments on the use of the term.

• We corrected the OR in the abstract

• We make explicit now in what selection the adjusted model was run.

• All 18 other sm