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Reviewer's report:

Title: Suggest revising the title as there were many variables that were not controlled. For example, the information that the non-PACT women received and different measures for cessation for the PACT and comparison groups.

1. The questions are well defined. The researchers wanted to determine the efficacy of the PACT in increasing cessation during pregnancy. The background information is useful. It is helpful to know the legislative history and smoking trends in Norway.

2. The methods are appropriate. Using a baseline control and then introducing the intervention is reasonable given the scope of the study. It would have been stronger if the researchers had measured the degree to which the PACT intervention was implemented. We don’t know if the lack of significant findings for pregnant women was because the intervention was not efficacious or if the intervention was not delivered as planned. The researchers provided training to providers, but we don’t know to what degree the providers actually implemented the intervention. It would be helpful to include the author’s definition of atopic on p.4. It would also be helpful to include a brief discussion about how they avoided women being counted more than once in the comparisons of PACT women, Trondheim, Bergen, and the whole of Norway.

3. Soundness of the data. It would have been stronger for smoking/cessation rates to be collected at the same time during pregnancy and postpartum for all comparison groups. but in this instance that was not possible. The researchers need to include p values when they report changes. For example, are the differences in rates in Table 3 (and pp 8 & 9) statistically significantly different?

4. Standards for reporting were used.

5. The discussion is good and notes the limitations of the data.

6. Adequate literature to support their discussion is provided.

7. The abstract provides a good summary.

8. The writing is acceptable.

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