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Dear Dr. Good,

We would like to thank you for giving us an opportunity to revise our research article entitled “An investigation of the smoking behaviours of parents before, during and after the birth of their children in Taiwan” (MS: 6380226851564452). We also appreciate the reviewers for helping us to further improve our article. In this revision, we have incorporated the reviewers’ suggestions. Along with this letter, please find our responses to the reviewers’ comments. We hope that you find this version substantially improved and acceptable for publication.

Thank you for your attention and we look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Likwang Chen
Responses to Reviewer 1

We would like to thank you for helping us to further improve this article. In this revision, we have incorporated your suggestions. In addition, we have to apologize for previously making a typo in our program for calculating the results in Table 2 in the old version (Table 1 in the new version). We have corrected this mistake, and the new results are thus slightly different from what we showed previously. In this new version, we also excluded women not being married at the time of interview from our sample. We lost 74 cases by doing so. This is for making the samples for women and men exactly the same. In the survey, only women being married at the time of interview reported their partners’ smoking status.

Below please find our responses. We also indicate the pages where you will find the suggested revisions.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. We have dropped this table, and only describe sample characteristics in the text of this new draft (page 9, the first paragraph in the Results section). Only variables of interest in this paper are reported. While not including this table in the new draft, we include it in the supplementary file (Supplementary Table 1) for readers’ reference purposes. We have also tried to improve the format of this table to make it clear.

2. We have condensed information in this table, and this table is the first table for the new draft. We are sorry that our previous version of this table is confusing. In this table, we show the smoking prevalence rates at different times of the childbearing period, rather than the rates for parents with different numbers of children. So, we think it is not so important to calculate an overall rate. The rate looking like the overall rate in our old version of table was actually the rate of 2000 (the current rate at the time of survey). Therefore, it is possible that this rate is not somewhere between the smoking prevalence rates at different previous times of the childbearing period. To avoid confusion, we dropped the information on the rate of 2000 in the new version of this table. Regarding the actual numbers, we have included them in this new version. About the rate of 2000, we still report it, but move this to the second paragraph in the Results section (the last two lines on page 9 and the first 6 lines on page 10). The corresponding actual numbers for the rate of 2000 can be found in Supplementary Table 1 (the first two lines of numbers). We hope that such an arrangement is acceptable.

3. Again, we apologize for not making tables easy to read previously. We have improved the format of these two tables (Tables 3 and 4 in the old version, and Tables 2 and 3 in the new version). We hope that the new tables are not confusing. As to whether we were examining the actual first and second births, we were not “exactly” doing so, but the information on the birth order in the data is very close to the real birth order. About this, please see the second paragraph on page 7, and the first paragraph on page 8 for clarification.
Minor essential revisions:
1. We are sorry for forgetting to upload this appendix. We dropped this appendix in the new version, since we decided to directly include the three socio-economic variables (education, occupation, income) in the multivariate analyses for the new version. While we dropped this appendix in the new draft, we put this appendix on the last page of this document for your reference. Indeed, social class is a complicated concept, and we previously failed to use terminology clearly and precisely. We hope that direct inclusion of the three socio-economic variables in the multivariate analyses is acceptable. As to why we previously used different reference groups for men and women in this regard, it was because the distributions of this social class variable for men and women were substantially different, and we thus had to use different reference groups for men and women to avoid multicollinearity problems in our multivariate analyses.

Discretionary revisions
1. We have tried to incorporate your suggestions for revising these two tables. They are Tables 2 and 3 in this version. We hope that they look clear now.
2. We have also tried to incorporate your suggestions for revising these two tables. The information is now in Table 4. About the actual numbers in the data, we did not include them in the body of the paper, but put them in Supplementary Table 2. Besides, while we dropped information on the coefficients for residential region and district in this Table 4, we put them in Supplementary Tables 3A and 3B for reference purposes.
Responses to Reviewer 2

We would like to thank you for helping us to further improve this article. In this revision, we have incorporated your suggestions. In addition, we have to apologize for previously making a typo in our program for calculating the results in Table 2 in the old version (Table 1 in the new version). We have corrected this mistake, and the new results are thus slightly different from what we showed previously. In this new version, we also excluded women not being married at the time of interview from our sample. We lost 74 cases by doing so. This is for making the samples for women and men exactly the same. In the survey, only women being married at the time of interview reported their partners’ smoking status.

Below please find our responses. We also indicate the pages where you will find the suggested revisions.

Major compulsory revisions

1. We have reorganized our manuscript referring to your suggestion. We hope the current draft looks acceptable. We have one specific explanation to make about this point. We still reported the response rate in the Data section. It was because this main purpose of this survey was not for studying parental smoking behaviour. Therefore, we hope that it is acceptable to put information with respect to the response rate in the Data section.

2. We have dropped this table (Table 1 in the old version), and only describe sample characteristics in the text of this new draft (page 9, the first paragraph in the Results section). Only variables of interest in this paper are reported. While not including this table in the new draft, we include it in the supplementary file (Supplementary Table 1) for readers’ reference purposes. We have also tried to improve the format of this table to make it clear.

3. We are sorry that our previous version of this table (Table 2 in the old version) is confusing. In this table, we show the smoking prevalence rates at different times of the childbearing period, rather than the rates for parents with different numbers of children. We did not statistically test whether these parents’ smoking prevalence rates at different times were different. In the new version of this table (Table 1 in the new version), we pooled categories for the 3rd child and all children with a higher birth order. This was for condensing information without losing important information.

The rate looking like the overall rate in our old version of table was actually the rate of 2000 (the current rate at the time of survey). To avoid confusion, we dropped the information on the rate of 2000 in the new version of this table. About the rate of 2000, we now report it in the second paragraph in the Results section, and also show the results from statistically testing whether parents with different numbers of children had different smoking prevalence rates in 2000 (see the last two lines on page 9 and the first 6 lines on page 10). The corresponding actual
numbers for the rate of 2000 can be found in Supplementary Table 1 (the first two lines of numbers). We hope that these arrangements are acceptable.

4. We have improved the format of these two tables (Tables 3 and 4 in the old version, and Tables 2 and 3 in the new version), and tried to avoid calculations based on very small samples. We also revised the headings for the two tables. We hope that the new headings are not confusing.

5. We also made revisions with respect to the headings for the two tables (Tables 5 and 6 in the old version, and Table 4 in the new version). We hope that the heading for the new Table 4 is not confusing.

6. We decided to directly include the three socio-economic variables (education, occupation, income) in the multivariate analyses for the new version. Indeed, social class is a complicated concept, and we previously failed to use terminology clearly and precisely. We hope that direct inclusion of the three socio-economic variables in the multivariate analyses is acceptable. As to why we previously had to pool different classes, it was because the distributions of this social class variable for men and women were skewed, and we thus had to pool some classes to avoid multicollinearity problems in our multivariate analyses.

7. We show odds ratios with respect to various explanatory variables, and report the Wald statistic for detecting model significance.

8. About the SES measures, please see our response to your sixth question above, as well as our response to the first reviewer’s question for the minor essential revision.

Minor Essential revisions

1. Regarding children’s impaired health due to ETS, we now refer to the 2006 and the 2007 US Surgeon General’s Reports (#2 and #3 in the new reference list).

2. We have tried to improve our discussion with respect to policy implication in this new version. We hope that you find the new Discussion section much more constructive.
Appendix: Definition of social class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Occupational type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least some graduate school</td>
<td>High-rank professional, entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Professional, manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>Administrative employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or some high school</td>
<td>Small shop owner, clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>Skilled labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school or less</td>
<td>Semi-skilled labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-skilled labour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class I: Professional, manager, high-rank professional, entrepreneur
Class II: Administrative employee, skilled labour
Class III: Small shop owner, clerk, semi-skilled labour
Class IV: Elementary school or less, non-skilled labour
Class V: College, high school or some high school