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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has been significantly improved. It is now easy to read and easy to follow the method and groups. The title describes the content of the manuscript.

Table 3: you do not mention the most important finding: that for persons smoking >20 cig/day LIT was not enough to obtain continuous abstinence. It was 12 times more probable to be smoke-free if these heavy smokers received intensive help. This message should be added to the conclusion and abstract (that HIT should be offered to those who smoke >20 cig/day and those who are unable to quit with LIT support, in combination with other support.)

In the end of the discussion the authors claim that a cotinine test was not an option. This is not correct. Only, the authors then should have defined another cut-off for those using NRT. The authors also claim that self-reported abstinence is as correct as biochemical validation. Even though the authors have one reference (25), this is in general only true when it comes to population based studies, not face-to-face settings, as this study. A miss-classification (people lie) of 10-20% is not unusual in studies like this.

The authors write that they can not explain why people with higher levels of education gain more from the HIT protocol. The HIT protocol is designed by well educated people, delivered by well educated people and therefore best accepted by well educated people. Many previous studies have shown that people with higher education attend e.g. smoking cessation groups more frequently and have higher success rates.

I would recommend, in the discussion part, to delete all references to tables and not to write OR but explain the results in a more fluent language. Also the titles of the parts should be removed.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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