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Dear Editor,

Thank you for a speedy re-review of the revised manuscript. We are delighted to know that the reviewers have agreed upon the revisions made to the previous version of the manuscript.

We have checked the whole manuscript for typos and misspellings and made corrections throughout the manuscript.

Please note that on page 11 under the section ‘Data Collection’ the details about informed consent have been written.

*The purpose of the survey was explained and assurance about the confidentiality of the information provided was given to the students. After such briefing, they were invited to participate in the survey. Informed consent of the students was sought and the students were informed that they were free to opt not to participate in the survey.*

We believe that this version of the manuscript is favorably considered for publication.

Regards

On behalf of all the authors

Chandrashekhar T Sreeramareddy

**Reviewer’s report**

**Title:** Prevalence and determinants of tobacco use amongst junior collegiates in twin cities of western Nepal: A cross-sectional, questionnaire-based survey  
**Version:** 2  
**Date:** 25 January 2008  
**Reviewer:** Rob Mcgee  
**Reviewer’s report:**  
I have read this re-submitted manuscript and the accompanying letter. In the light of my initial review I believe that the authors have met the points I raised, where possible. The issue of the multi-level modelling of the data remains. However, as the authors do not have access to an appropriate statistical package to do this analysis, I think it would be churlish to reject it for that reason. The data are important for Nepal and should be reported. The authors have clarified their socioeconomic index based upon household assets. I still found a few instances of misspellings. These should be corrected by the authors or at the journal's editorial stage if possible.
Authors’ Reply: The manuscript was checked for misspellings and corrections were made.

One small point is that based on the figures provided in Table 1, it seems that 91 students used both cigarettes and chewing tobacco, 13 were chewing only, and 59 smoking only. I think these figures are right. If so, the % currently using any product is more like 10.2%, not the 9.5% given in the abstract and text in the Results section. This would be worth checking.

Authors’ Reply: We checked the data and the corrections was made both in results as well as abstract.

In Table 1, the last line of the Table should read "Currently using both forms of product" not "any". Otherwise, it looks fine.

Authors’ Reply: correction was made.