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Reviewer’s report:

This is a good paper, on an important subject, and well analysed and presented. Thus all my comments are in the minor category. I have made them in the order of the manuscript. Table 1 presents only percentages: I would prefer to have the values too. Further T1 is actually 2 tables (this may be an error of the PDF) - should they be Tables 1a and 1b? In the discussion, the advantage of this study being prospective is not adequately made: I'd use that precise word in the second paragraph. One limitation not mentioned is the fact that it is a women-only study - does that make the income analysis any less solid? In the discussion, I would have preferred more on why this study suggests that smoking and stage accounts for the SES survival differences. If it's stage, then surely there must be diagnostic issues here (even if references 7 & 8 think not). Furthermore, the smoking explanation is not just that smoking causes more and nastier cancers, it also causes co-morbidities. I remember some years ago a chest physician saying half his lung cancers died of myocardial infarctions (I suspect he overstated the percentage!)

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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