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Reviewer's report:

General
One of the major public health problem is discussed.
Overall write-up is good. Sampling frame and study participant's selection methods are sound.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. Title of the manuscript is not matching with the study objectives.
2. The sentence written in abstract and background ‘infers policy implications’ is not a study objective.
3. Two of the three keywords are not accordance with the study objectives.
4. In methods session, brief description of ‘Heartfile’ should be mentioned.
5. In the description of questionnaire, it is unclear that how authors labeled the knowledge as ‘correct’. In addition, knowledge assessment is not the study objective.
6. Level of education was defined twice (repetition): under the heading of ‘Defining level of education’ and in one paragraph before that heading.
7. In results session, knowledge variables are not in accordance of study objectives.
8. In discussion session, authors have compared ‘tobacco consumption’ with ‘smoking prevalence’. Both terms has different interpretation and understanding.
9. Number of times, authors used the word ‘consumption’ which has a broad understanding; more focused word like ‘use’ is a better option.
10. Reference number 21 is not required.
11. Reference style is not according to the BMC: Public Health guidelines.
12. In discussion, subheading: How do we translate --------, is not appropriate.
13. Generalization of the results in light of study limitations is not mentioned.
14. Some recommendations like number 7th and 10th are not accordance to the study objectives.
15. In table 2, distribution (column percentages) of different variables by tobacco consumption is given which translate little information. Prevalence (row percentages) is a better option here.
16. In table 2, an additional column is required to represent the overall description of study population by studied variables.
17. In table 2, chi-square and p values make no logic, hence not required.
18. Title of the table 3 is not appropriate. Mentioning bi-variate and multivariate is not required. Terms ‘Odds Ratio’ and ‘Adjusted Odds Ratio’ are self-explanatory.
20. In table 3, for every variable category, p-values are mentioned. P-value should be one for each variable (not for its categories) and should be given in the same row of variable.
21. In table 3, p-values have little meaning while reporting odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals.
22. In fig.1, histogram is not a suggestive way to present data, it should be ‘Bar chart’

---

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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