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Dear Sir:

We have followed all the suggestions raised by the Editor and the referees. Please find below a point-by-point answer to the Comments. We hope that the new version or our manuscript satisfies your requirements.

With kind regards

Miguel Delgado-Rodríguez, on behalf of all authors.

Point-by-point answer

Editorial comments
Please could you also clarify the following points in the manuscript and cover letter:

1) Was the data obtained from one hospital or more than one hospital: ANSWER: one hospital. It has been included

2) Why are the date ranges in the Figures different from those in the tables? If this is correct please comment on how this may affect the conclusions. ANSWER: There has been an error as a consequence of using a similar report for the regional Cantabrian government (using the 1996 Spanish National Survey on Health) as the base document for this manuscript. The study period of this report is 1998-2002.

We request that you make some formatting changes…

Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style (http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals). It is important that your files are correctly formatted. ANSWER: We have verified that our revised manuscript conforms to the journal style.

Authors' contributions - Please include an Authors' contributions section before the Acknowledgements and Reference list. ANSWER: It was an Authors’ contribution in the first version of the manuscript and also appears in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer's report

Reviewer: Judith Lumley
General …

Its strengths …

The proportion of women smoking in pregnancy showed almost no change (32.6% to 31.5%), which is disappointing, and a high proportion by comparison with recent randomised trial data (in the standard care arms). ANSWER. This comment does not recommend any change.

What is also clear in the paper is that there have been substantial changes in smoking behaviour before pregnancy: a reduction from 53% to 40% of women. As a consequence of this population change in smoking, smoking cessation during pregnancy actually fell during the 5 year period of observation. ANSWER. This comment does not recommend any change.

The associations of smoking and quitting are very similar to those elsewhere, except for the benefit of adequate prenatal care (Kessner Index), which hasn’t been shown before but which probably reflects active & early participation in pregnancy care. I am not aware that higher parity has been associated with pregnancy smoking but it may be an association with relative poverty? Higher education and being married are usually associated with a lower prevalence of smoking in pregnancy as they are in this study. ANSWER: You are correct, parity is associated with a lower social class. In univariate analyses, social class was not significantly related to smoking cessation. The inverse relationship between social class and smoking seen in other countries is not clear in Spain. In fact, when women began to smoking in Spain (in the late 70s, once we entered in democracy, and 80s) it was related to a high social class. This pattern still persists, although there are current reports in which cessation rates are higher in wealthy people and less women of high social class begin to smoke. In our region this mixed generational pattern (the past association between high social class and smoking and the current inverse association) persists, and that is the reason why social class is not currently a clear determinant.

**Major Compulsory Revisions** (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached): None. ANSWER. This comment does not recommend any change.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

There is one paragraph (2nd sentence of 2nd para P 10) which needs to be rewritten for clarity. ANSWER: It has been reworded.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I would have liked to see a definite plan outlined for a smoking cessation program in the hospital -ideally a trial -but given the five years of baseline data a hospital-wide intervention and implementation plan would be an appropriate alternative. ANSWER: the data were provided to the regional ministry of Health to improve prenatal advice programs on smoking cessation. We did not write any comment on this as we thought it was obvious.
I found the Tables a bit difficult, probably because the description of the analyses, which was very clear in the text of the paper, was not summarised on the same page as the Tables. Reporting the procedures used for the analyses at the foot of the Tables might be helpful. **ANSWER:** The analyses used in tables 1 and 2 have been detailed at the foot of the tables.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No

**Reviewer's report: Mohammad Mohsin**

General Data figures in the methods/results/discussions/conclusion do not correlate with the table figures as in the methods/results/discussions/conclusion, the time period mentioned is 1995-1999 while in the table figures, the time period is 1998-2002 shows that the data is biased. **ANSWER:** There has been an error as a consequence of using a similar report for the regional Cantabrian government (using the 1996 Spanish National Survey on Health) as the base document for this manuscript. The study period is 1998-2002.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) There are many grammar and spelling mistakes Tile is misnomer, it should be "Smoking among pregnant women" and correct the same used anywhere in the article. **ANSWER:** we have revised the English and the change suggested has been adopted throughout the text.

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

**Statistical review:** Yes