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Reviewer's report:

The current manuscript detailed a study on the effectiveness of a smoking cessation intervention in a dental clinic in Sweden. The investigators succeed with the very challenging effort of implementing a randomized trial in a clinical setting. Overall, my response to this study is positive. My detailed review follows.

1. Major Compulsory Revisions

Introduction. The introduction is quite brief. I recommend additional information related to the importance of tobacco intervention in dental settings. The authors did not provide any convincing or relevant information about the relationship between oral health and smoking. I also recommend omission of any mention of cost effectiveness. A cost effectiveness analysis is a distinct area of investigation. While I encourage the authors to consider another manuscript formally examining cost effectiveness, it is not the focus of the current manuscript. To say that is will be examined and not to do so formally is misleading. That said, it is important to state the specific aim of the investigation in the introduction.

Methods and materials. It is essential for the authors to provide details on which parts of the methods were standard care and which parts were developed or implemented as a function of the study. As written, it is not clear.

Broadly speaking, the methods section needs additional details. This is the major weakness of the paper. Of note, the inclusion and exclusion criteria are not specified—the sample should be detailed, along with enrollment procedures. In addition, each intervention (LTI vs. HTI) should be detailed—a comparison chart might be helpful. This will aid others who want to replicate or conduct similar interventions. Data collection details also are needed (i.e., the “who, what, when, and where” of data collection procedures). I also recommend the use of headers for reader clarity.

Measures. The measures need to be identified and described, as appropriate.

Quit definition—the pathway from the abstinence question “Have you smoked during the past seven days?” to point prevalence calculation is confusing. Please clarify how a yes/no question produced quantifiable data for point prevalence and continuous abstinence analyses.
Willingness to quit—the authors note that the sample included those willing to quit. Please explain how willingness was assessed or determined.

Analyses. Please specify what statistical tests were used to calculate quit rates. In addition, the attrition analyses was confusing. Again, perhaps headers will help guide the reader.

Results and Discussion: The discussion was somewhat fragmented. The HTI treatment was generally twice as effective as the LTI. Oddly, the authors argue against using the HTI as the first line of treatment, claiming that LTI is more cost effective. I do not think this argument is justified. A formal cost effectiveness analyses is the only way to make this determination. Importantly, three times more HTI than LTI participants reported 6-month continuous abstinence—this is a major finding. Although discussing practice guidance is important, I think it may be presumptuous to recommend the LTI over the HTI. Why not recommend the optimal treatment as the first line of intervention? The study found significant outcomes for HTI—highlight this outcome rather than diminish it. Additionally, there are very interesting findings shown in Tables 3-4; these findings warrant more discussion.

Also, please discuss gender differences in more detail. This are interesting findings.

2. Minor Essential Revisions

Overall, the manuscript is difficult to follow in places. Headers should be applied. Also, the paper needs to be reviewed extensively for English grammar and syntax.

The tables are cumbersome. Please consider alternate formats. For example, in Table 1, sub divide each column (under Total, HTI, LTI) by gender (M/F), instead of separating Men and Women on the far left column. Comparisons will be simplified.

Discretionary Revisions

Clearly state up front the specific purpose of the investigation and discuss the findings accordingly. In the conclusion, state why this study is relevant and what it contributes to the field. Also, state the possible future investigations

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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