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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript present a more sophisticated approach to measuring smoking habits than just smoking status at interview. This is the major strength. In the Discussion, the authors reflection on the pros and cons of measuring smoking status in various ways is interesting. I think the manuscript is well written and suitable for publicaiton. Some comments however:

1. It is difficult to find information on time from diagnosis of PC to time when they were included in the study as well as the age of the time of the interview.

2. Despite a good discussion on the strengths and limitations, it would have been valuable to make an assessment sample size or view the sample size in the light of the power to detect a clinically relevant difference (if such exist?) in odds between smokers vs non-smokers.

3. The discussion on recall bias is important but reference to the studies with the kappa values was a bit unclear and would benefit from some clarification.

4. For a layman not skilled in Life Course analysis, it is unclean if the method only refer to the general philosophy of attempting to document the full history (instead of the instantaneous smoking status at the interview) or if it is more formal methodology?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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