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Reviewer’s report:

In this revised version, the authors have take into account most of the reviewers’ remarks. I’ve particularly noted the practical suggestions for interventions in the conclusion. However, in my opinion, there are still a few weaknesses.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Introduction:

The authors have made an effort to reshape their introduction. However, based on the references used, it is still unclear what this paper adds to existing literature. For instance, the authors cite that TTM-based interventions yielded little to no benefit for smoking cessation during pregnancy. They should therefore clearly explain why they choose to use this theoretically frame and what novel approach they are adding to the body of knowledge.

Also, they authors mention publications of Stotts and Scheibmeir already show that pregnant women adopt less behavioral as well as experiential strategies to stop smoking. What is thus the objective of their work? Is it simply to illustrate/confirm these findings?

Methods and Results:

The methods and results are presented more clearly.

I notice now that the authors do not indicate the proportion of smokers/ex-smokers among pregnant and non-pregnant women. This concerns me, as 60.5% of pregnant women were in maintenance stage and the average number of cigarettes smoked was low. Could it be because most pregnant women in the sample were not smoking anymore? One can thus wonder if there’s enough data to draw any conclusion on pregnant smokers. Anyways, this information should be mentioned in the methods and presented as a limit in the discussion.

The association between relationship status (or living with smokers/ non smokers) and smoking has been documented in literature. Authors should present and discuss it as such.

- Minor Essential Revisions

Tables:

Consistency in terms used:
“college education” in the text becomes “degree” on table 1.
“acceptability of smoking” in the text becomes “acceptability of smoke” on table 4.
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