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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Page 6:
A subgroup of HTI participants did not complete the program. How many and why?

In future, you can collect information about whether or not participants in a condition such as the LTI read the program materials, followed the recommendations, etc.

The authors used only complete case and intent-to-treat analyses. They should use other, more accurate imputation methods, such as EM (expectation-maximization) method which estimates missing values by an iterative process.

Page 8:
There appears to be differential attrition by condition, but no tests were conducted. Were there statistically significant differences in attrition by condition?

Page 9:
There is reporting of differences between conditions having to do with “support” received. However, there is no description of what the support might be. The reader needs to know what kind of support participants reported using.

Results about NRT use are reported, but there’s no mention earlier about whether or not use of NRT was recommended in the LTI condition.

Data are presented on the use of snus as a substitute for smoking, but the gender of those using snus is not mentioned. Given the gender differences in use of oral tobacco, this information would be useful to the reader.

Pages 9-10:
The authors report that number of cigarettes smoked (cigarette consumption) was predictive of quitting and that those participants who had higher consumption at baseline were more likely to drop out. Cigarette consumption should be taken into account when using the EM method of analysis mentioned above to provide more accurate results.
Authors discuss the cost effectiveness of the two interventions. They did not perform a cost analysis, therefore cannot make any claims/statements about the relative cost/benefits of the interventions. Any mention of cost effectiveness should be removed from the manuscript.

There is discussion of the use of telephone quitlines, but no there's no mention of whether or not this type of resource was suggested for use in either of the intervention conditions. There is no report of whether or not the participants in this study used telephone quitines, therefore there should be no discussion of quitlines in the manuscript.

The statement that the high number of participants in this study who reported a desire to quit indicates that there’s a widespread desire among daily smokers in Sweden to quit is erroneous. This was a sample of smokers visiting a healthcare provider. This population is much more likely to be experiencing health problems and to be motivated to quit at higher rates than the general population of smokers.

There is no basis for the claim that “drop outs probably did not seriously effect [sic] the main results in the analysis presented in Table 3.” Analysis of differential attrition should be conducted, and new analyses using the EM method suggested above should be used for the results.

Last paragraph of discussion, second sentence should read “The lack of statistical significance in the present analysis is probably due to insufficient statistical power.”
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