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Reviewer's report:

The paper is evaluating two interventions, a low and a high intensity intervention, to help smokers stop smoking. The study was performed in the health care system and dentistry. This study is of importance because more data are needed about the effectiveness of smoking cessation methods in these settings.

The paper would gain from a better structure of methods and results. There is also a lack of reference to relevant smoking cessation literature in both background and discussion. Please see detailed comments below;

Major Compulsory revisions

Title:"Effectiveness of smoking cessation in a dentistry setting in Sweden- a randomized trial".

1 The title is misleading. The paper is mainly a comparison between two cessation methods, low and high intensity treatment, with patients from the health care, dentistry and industrial health service.
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Abstract
Conclusion
2 Your methods cannot get credit for people using other modes of smoking cessation, unless you believe that patients become more likely to seek help to quit smoking, if they had been taking part in your interventions. If that is the case that should be stated explicitly.
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Introduction
3 Since the aim of the study is to investigate low and high intensity interventions for smoking cessation it is important that you, as part of your background, provide an overview of earlier studies of low and high intensity interventions published in this area.
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Material and methods
4 It is difficult to follow the current division into subheadings since there is a
mixture of different types of information under each one. It would be better if you use the traditional subheadings like subjects, sample, study design, procedure, measures, statistics and ethical approval.

5 Were smokers who used snuff included?
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6. Explain why it was not possible to get information about participants not completing the program?

Results
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7 In order to make the text easier to read use subheadings.

8 How many smokers were recruited from the health care, dentistry and industrial health service respectively?
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9 What do you mean with "additional support"?

10 Remove "(not in table)".
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11 Give the number of patients in the dropout analysis.
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Discussion

12 Do not refer to tables in the discussion. Describe your findings with words.

13 “Overall, the LTI-group responding to the questionnaire was approximately .......”.

When you draw conclusions from result of the interventions do not use limited groups. It would be of value if you could compare the cost-effectiveness of the two methods based on intention-to-treat data.

14 Why do you advice about quit lines as additional support? Have you studied that? It is not mentioned in the result.
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15 You say that you cannot evaluate the self-help manual. In my opinion the reason for this is that you have a 30-minutes treatment session and that you lack a control group. Remove the other reasons.
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16 Remove the paragraph about quite lines. I don’t see how it is relevant for this study?

17 There is no data in the study showing that more women accepted to
participate than men. Do you know if the number of men and women asked to participate differed? What was the proportion of men and women among the 63 who declined to participate?
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18 Make a shorter statement about depression and cessation, as your data are weak.

19. What are the limitations of the study? Discuss the weakness with self-reported abstinence.
Discuss that you only have continuous abstinence for the last 6 months at the 12 months follow-up.
Discuss the limits with results from treatment free of charge.

Conclusion:

20 Why should the support be given within dentistry? This matter should be discussed in the “Discussion” with pros and cons.
You need to know if LTI is more cost-effective than HTI to give a recommendation.
Don’t suggest support of quit lines, if you do not know if it works in the combination with LTI.

21 Figure 1. Do not mix the number of participants in the flow chart with the results of the intervention.

Minor Essential Revisions
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Paragraph 1

1 Why did you choose 5% difference? What success rates had you expected and what data did you base that on?
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Last paragraph

2 Criteria for continuous smoking should be based on relapse curves, which you can find in the literature. You only measure a continuous abstinence of 6 months.
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3 Is “Abnormally” depressive mood the right word?

4 Table 3 What does “(ref)” mean?
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