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Dear Editors

We thank the reviewers for continued review of our work. We are pleased that we have met Reviewer 1’s requests. Below we detail our responses to questions from Reviewer 2. We provide the line numbers where we have revised the text in response to the comments and have included the revised text in red in the manuscript. Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

1. Would suggest having explanation for including BMI in the method section or introduction. It just appears in the methods without explanation.

On lines 124 and 125 we have added an explanation for including BMI. Basically it is a risk factor for smoking initiation, and therefore was examined as a risk for smokeless tobacco use. “We also examined body mass index (BMI), which was calculated using the height and weight measurements taken by trained interviewers at each interview, because it is associated with smoking behavior among youth in this cohort [8].”

2. One page 4, line 108 please include wave 3 before 2010-2011 to make it clear that the risk factors and outcomes are assessed at different waves.

To clarify the sentence we have added: The risk factor data presented in the current analysis were gathered at wave 2 in 2008-09, while the outcome data were gathered through wave 3 in 2010-11.

3. Please provide alpha for MacArthur Scale.

The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status is a one item measure and as such it is not possible to calculate an alpha.

4. The explanation of missing data is not sufficient. Explaining missing data procedures and classification of missing data in the response to reviewers without any mention of it in the text is useless. The authors should have a clear and concise explanation of missing data in the text. Complete case analysis may provide biased estimates! The authors should compare those with complete data vs those with missing data. This is a really easy fix but has not been corrected.

In response to your request we compared those with complete data vs those with missing data. We have added the following text starting on line 181: We examined differences in gender distribution, mean age, parental educational attainment distribution, mean subjective social status, mean body mass index, and mean anxiety between participants with complete data and included in the analysis and those with missing data and excluded from the analysis. Participants with missing data and who were excluded from the analysis were comparable on all baseline parameters save one. They were significantly older than those included in the analysis (p<0.01).

5. Rephrase line 294 on page 8

The data were assessed via self-report and unverified using biological samples or other methods of cross-validation; STU may have been underreported by some and was inconsistently reported by roughly 20%.
6. Line 301 on page 9 should only mention the main findings. The other findings have been mentioned in the results section and earlier in the discussion.

We believe that only the main study findings are presented in the Conclusion and Implications section. We are happy to remove the first sentence, which now starts on line 306, if that would be appropriate.

We thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely, Anna