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Reviewer’s report:

The study was carried out to explore smoking and quitting characteristics among female nurses as compared to women in the general population and correlates of ever and recent quit attempts among smokers in both groups. The manuscript is well-written and easy to follow. The methodology of the study is accurate. The results are discussed against the background of other data coming from the US, which gives the readers an opportunity to get to know current evidence on the topic. The conclusions are well justified, although they should be revised a little. There are several other concerns, minor or discretionary, that should be addressed in the manuscript prior to it being accepted for publication.

Major concerns
I have none

Minor concerns
1) In the Abstract, in the first sentence referring to results, the assumption that “Nurses (16.63%) had a lower smoking prevalence than other women (12.09%)” is false. The rate 16.63% is not lower than the rate 12.09%. I suppose it is an editing error.

2) One of the demographic variables of the studied populations of women was the location, where the study was conducted. It was divided into specific regions: Northeast, Midwest, South, and West. For readers who come from somewhere other than the US it may be not clear which specific characteristics of these regions justify such a division. Was it done because of socioeconomic or cultural differences between them which might influence the prevalence of smoking and quitting among nurses? It could be mentioned for example in the Methods or the Discussion section.

3) I propose revising the Conclusions section. In my opinion, conclusions should only recapitulate the main findings of the study rather than comment on them, which is, in turn, preferable in the Discussion. For instance, the sentence: “Although the relatively low prevalence of smoking among nurses is encouraging, it remains much higher than the estimated 2% of physician smokers [25]” is better suited to the Discussion. As a conclusion it is enough to state that: “The prevalence of smoking nurses is relatively low in comparison to the general
population of women”. Similarly, the sentences: “Unlike other female professions, the negative impact of smoking on the health of nurses has been well established [8]”, “Evidence suggests that worksite smoking bans may encourage further quit attempts [36]”, and “As more and more medical campuses become smoke free, this may accelerate quit efforts of all healthcare professionals [37, 38]” should be placed in the Discussion section. These sentences describe findings of other studies rather than reflect conclusions resulting from the presented study.

Discretionary concerns

1) In Table 1 there is a typing error: the rate of female nurses who ever made a quit attempt should be 43.18% not 43.185. Although, on the other hand, any “%” sign should be placed in this Table as has been done in Table 2. Column labels specify percentages as units of the values showed in the tables, and there is no need to repeat them inside the columns.

2) The abbreviation SE used in tables should be explained in the footnote of the tables.

3) The second sentence before the Conclusion section “Additionally, we do not have information body weight” should be revised (“on” or “about” should be added before “body weight”)
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