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Reviewer's report:

The papers has been satisfactory reviewed. Most past of the reviewers' comments addressed. Thank you very much!!

I would just add some minor comments that would be very much appreciated if they are addressed before publication:

1. Abstract: In the methods section, there is a sentence "Unit costs were applied to utilisation..." that is too long and very hard to understand. Please, could you rephrase it?

2. Abstract: In the results section, you said "Average annual total costs per survey participant...". Please, could you specify if this survey participant, if this average annual cost belongs to a smoker, former smoker or never smoker?

3. Background: In the second line "The list of diseases caused...". Please, I think you could include a reference for this sentence!

4. Results: In the First paragraph (Unadjusted analyses), the sentence "Overall, mean total annual costs were €3,844..." needs to report whether is per smoker patient, or former smoker, etc...

5. Results: In the second paragraph (Regression analysis) about the sentence "Current smokers showed significantly lower odds ratios for physician visits..." I think that you should incorporate in the discussion the implications of this lower odds ratios for current smokers, if there are any.

6. Discussion: In the second paragraph, about the sentence "Our findings that current smokers showed a lower..." should specify compared to what current smokers showed a lower probability of physicians treatments.

7. Discussion: In the thirs paragraph, about the sentence "Nevertheless, subsample analysis showed that even former smokers...", please, could you state or size how much costs in average cost former smokers compared to smokers?

8. and, Discussion: End of page 15, about the sentence "Disregarding issues of representativeness...". Please, could you report why and how sensible could be your results in terms of representativeness?
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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