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Reviewer's report:

For the most part the authors have dealt with the concerns of the reviewers. One issue that had been raised before was where the ex smokers were in the analysis. The authors have indicated that they are lumped with the non-smokers. This may or may not be ok. Would like to see a statement in discussion that either by putting them with the smokers or leaving them out made no difference (or altered the analysis) to the analysis.

Second issue relates to the bottom of table 3. First it is difficult to understand why one would have expected difference by education level. If there were a difference the results might be hopelessly confounded. In fact the data are not significant and appear to go in the opposite direction than might be expected. No comment is made about this in the text. I would suggest that the second part of the table be left out and a sentence be added to the text.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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