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Reviewer’s report:

The authors’ responses seem fair. I noticed several minor points for revision.

[Major Compulsory Revisions]
(None)

[Minor Essential Revisions]
2-1. [Abstract] Results and Conclusions are ambiguous. In the present study, the intervention increased the patients’ opportunity to be advised, but did not change patients’ behavior. This result should be more clearly stated in the abstract.

2-2. [Page 11, 2nd para.] “p=25” -> “p=0.25”?

2-3. [Page 11, Discussion, 1st para. last sentence] I could not understand the sentence “Our evaluation adds …”. Do you mean that the program changed providers’ behavior but could not change patients’ behavior?

2-4. [Table 2] “Gave advice to quit tobacco use” -> “Gave advice to quit tobacco use”?
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Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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