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Dear Annabel,

thank you for giving us the opportunity to resubmit a second revision of the above mentioned paper. Please find attached the manuscript after our revision according to your formatting change requests and according to the comments of the reviewer. We considered each of the comments very carefully. Please find in the following text of this letter two lists of changes we made according to your formatting change requests and according to the comments of the reviewer.

We are delighted that you are interested in issuing a press release about our paper. Please feel free to do so and please contact me as the corresponding author for any further help you need. However, I will be out of office not before Febr 06 until Febr 13, 2006.

Corresponding author: Ulrich John, Prof., Director of the Institute of Epidemiology and Social Medicine, University of Greifswald, W.-Rathenau-Str. 48, D-17487 Greifswald, phone +3834 867700, fax +3834 867701
email: ujohn@uni-greifswald.de
internet: http://www.medizin.uni-greifswald.de/epidem

With kind regards

Ulrich
(on behalf of all authors)
List of changes made according to the formatting changes requested by the Editor

Formatting changes requested
--------------------------------------------
- Remove equal contributions symbol from title page.
- Remove line numbers in margins.
- Remove file name from top of each page.
- Please remove table placement text- tables will be included in the final version of the manuscript as near as possible to their first mention in the manuscript.

- Tables 1 and 2 must be divided into cells / fields. The borders of tables included as part of the manuscript file must be visible black lines.

Response

All requested changes have been done now.
List of changes made in the revised version of the paper according to the comments of reviewer: Martin Gulliford

Thank you very much for the very useful comments which in our view help to make the paper more readable. Please find below how we respond to each of them. Each comment is repeated below followed by our response.

Comment
Minor Essential Revisions
1. In the abstract, the simple comparison of proportions of current smokers is meaningless in the absence of information about the distribution of age and other confounders. Therefore, state that the odds ratios are ‘adjusted’ and list, in the methods section of the abstract, the variables included in the logistic model as confounders.

Response
Abstract: This has been done now.

Comment
2. In Table 1, give the exact P values to three decimal figures. In my view the chisquare statistics could be omitted, as could Cohen’s w, as the adjusted odds ratios in Table 2 are used as the main measures of effect or association.

Response
Table 1: We have now given the exact P values instead of ***: < 0.001, < 0.01, and < 0.05. However, due to hypothesis testing and established significance levels it does not seem to be useful to provide the p-values as they appear in the calculations. We propose not to omit the chisquare statistics and Cohen’s w since we have no other crude measures of associations, and the presentation of the chisquare statistics and Cohen’s w needs only limited space.
Comment

3. In Table 2, in the legend the word ‘relation’ should be replaced by ‘association’. The odds ratios and confidence limits should all be given to two decimal places, P values for overall association of variable with current smoking should be given.

Response

Table 2: The word ‘relation’ has been replaced with ‘association’ now. The odds ratios and confidence limits are given to two decimal places now. We propose not to give the P values for the associations of the variables with current smoking since this information is included in the confidence limits.

Comment

4. The paper raises a question concerning the differences between those who continue smoking and those who do not. The distributions for the confounders which are not shown – education, BMI, exercise – are therefore of interest and should be documented.

Response

Tables 1, 2: We have documented now education, BMI, and exercise and have given the odds ratios and confidence intervals.

Comment

5. The English would benefit from streamlining in some places. Eg p8 ‘circular illnesses’.

Response

The English has been proof-read now by colleagues fluent in English and the manuscript has been improved in several places, including ‘circular illnesses’.

- end of list -