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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions Although the authors changed their analyses and tables in some ways, the study aim, design, methods of analysis, and results are still reported in an unclear way, and their statistical methods are still inappropriate. I do not see much improvement in the latter respect, and suggest that the authors consult an experienced statistician for screening and revise their analyses and report. Relatedly, the authors should carefully consider and phrase their study aims. Their statements of aims on pages 2 (background) and page 4 (bottom) suggest that they want to (a) evaluate the intervention effect in Trondheim, and (b) look at trends in time in both PACT cohorts and wider, in Trondheim, Bergen and Norway. Their analyses of the cohorts in tables 3-6 likewise seem to swagger between intervention evaluation (at posttest = postnatal) and time trend evaluations.

In view of these major concerns about methods and reporting, I did not check introduction, discussion, or details of results as summarized in the text. Instead, my comments below focus on the methods of analysis chosen and on the tables. What next? If the authors fail to substantially improve their analyses and presentation in the next version, my advice will be to reject this manuscript.

Level of interest Whether the intervention itself and the Norwegian trends in perinatal smoking are of sufficient interest to the audience of BMC is up to the judgement of public health researchers and the editor.

Statistical review? See the list of comments on pages 2-5 of this report

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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