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Reviewer’s report:

This study examined the effect of intervention to smokers at dentists on the subsequent patients’ cessation behaviors. The research theme per se is very important, but I had many difficulties following the logical flow, as listed below.

[Major Compulsory Revisions]
1-1. The authors interpret the adverse result (the control group had higher quit rate) as the effect of biased distribution of sick smokers. However, it is possible that sick smokers are more likely to quit smoking than healthy smokers. These possibilities can be examined by stratified analysis or analysis excluding sick smokers.

[Minor Essential Revisions]
2-1. [Abstract] The current version of Abstract lacks important information. The method of randomization or follow-up is not described. The flow of the number of participants or facilities is also unknown. It does not tell the direction of difference between intervention and control groups.

2-2. [Background] The Background section should be more concise. Specifically, the paragraph starting “Tobacco control quality” (Page 4) could be shorter using relevant citations.

2-3. [Page 6, 3rd para.] “The tobacco control quality improvement program” -> “In the tobacco control quality improvement program,”??

2-4. [Results] The first four paragraphs should be moved to the Methods section.

2-5. [Page 9, last para.] I could not understand the expression “(N=n)”.

2-6. [Page 10, 4th line from the bottom] “approached statistical significance” -> “nearly approached statistical significance”

2-7. [Conclusion] The first 2 sentences should be move to the end of Discussion as limitations.

2-8. [Table 2] What does “C2 NRT USE” mean?

2-9. [Table 2] This table contains baseline results, and results after follow-up as well. These two types of results should be separately presented.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:

I have no conflict of interest.