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Reviewer’s report:

General
This manuscript shows the smoking prevalence among adults in the Southeast Anatolian Region (SEAR, Turkey). Although the sample is not representative of the general population in terms of age, sex and socioeconomic variables, the sample size is large and results add something to the literature on the issue of smoking prevalence in the South Eastern Europe. Unfortunately, the manuscript could not be acceptable in the present form because of several major (and minor) points.
In fact, besides the presence of several typos and the lack of a good revision of the literature, the entire text is not clear and sometimes misleading.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1) the second paragraph of the Background section of the ABSTRACT should be included in the Methods section;
2) some paragraphs of the ABSTRACT (Results: “Respiratory symptoms were high in current smokers”; Conclusions: “Passive smoking must be prevented especially in the houses where children and pregnant women live”) are trivial and do not add information to the issue. They should be deleted or revised.
3) the BACKGROUND section should include what is already known on the issue of smoking prevalence in the SEAR or in Turkey (with corresponding relevant references) and not on the issue of the effects of smoking on morbidity/mortality.
4) in the METHODS section, statistical analyses are not clear. For example, for what concerns multivariate analysis, covariates included in the logistic regression models are not listed.
5) in TABLE 2, smoking prevalence in various strata should be standardized by age to estimate the correct association between education, marital status and employment, and smoking status.
6) II and III paragraph of the RESULTS section: if 70.1% of houses had at least one regular daily smoker (II paragraph), it is impossible that 79% of houses included “a smoker and a pregnant woman” (III paragraph). Probably the authors wanted to state that 79% of houses included “a smoker and a pregnant woman” (III paragraph). Probably the authors wanted to state that 79% of houses with at least a smoker included a pregnant woman.
7) the DISCUSSION section should compare results with previous available data. The trend of smoking prevalence over time is essential to identify the strata of the population (particularly in terms of sex and education) at major risk to increase their smoking prevalence, and consequently to choose how to address anti-smoking campaigns. For example, I am a little bit sceptical about the fact that “… in SEAP region anti-smoking campaigns should target men”. In fact, according to the model by Lopez et al. (Tobacco Control 1994; 3: 242-247) it has been shown that South-eastern European regions should be in the III stage of the smoking epidemic (http://www.who.int/tobacco/global_data/country_profiles/Introduction.pdf). According to this model, we expect in the next few decades an increase of smoking prevalence in women and a decrease in men. In this case, anti-smoking campaigns should target primarily women.
8) The English language should be completely reviewed, and the references updated (for example,
the new Monograph on passive smoking by IARC should be cited).

---

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)

---

**What next?:** Reject because scientifically unsound

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No
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