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Reviewer's report:

General: This paper is of a small study, but one which adds important new information about how to treat non-respondents in smoking cessation trials, especially ones that are managed at a distance. While small, it is scupulous about highlighting the limitatins, and as it goes acounter to widely held, but not evidence-based, beliefs, it is a useful wake-up call.

Publication of small studies like this is likely to stimulate debate over how to deal with non-respondents in a manner that is more realistic than current strategies.

---------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

---------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

---------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I think it could be shortened a little, by either removing the sample description that overlaps the figure, or by removing the Figure.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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