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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory
The abstract is misleading and makes it sound like the intervention was very nearly found to be effective. In fact the nearly significant finding is for the control intervention being 'more effective' than the intervention. The only viable conclusion from this study is 'There is no evidence that educating dentists to make brief interventions increases the rate of smoking cessation in their patients.'

This is a cluster randomised trial but many details required by the CONSORT variant for cluster trials are missing. Please supply a CONSORT statement. For example, it is unclear how many people were 'enrolled' and how many were followed up.

Please report the unadjusted and adjusted ORs.
Advice on quitting smoking can work either by increasing the rate at which people try to stop or their success. Have you data on attempts to quit smoking in the six months?

There are no details of the intervention. Appendix A was missing. This might be the website not allowing me to see it, but it is of course important. Could you give a descriptive overview of the intervention in the main text? Also, the state of the art approach to evaluating behavioural interventions is to describe their components in terms of the taxonomy of behavioural techniques and there is a variant of this for smoking cessation. (See the work of Michie and West). If you have not done so, please could you give these details in the appendix?

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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