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We are grateful to you for the comments to our paper. We have carefully considered each of your recommendations and the effect each would have on the final product. Of course, the English is problematic for us, but prof. Fiona Brooks from UK who is Englishwomen helped to edit the text. Our answers to your comments are provided below.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Comment 1:
The authors adjusted for gender and age. Although the main focus of the research in the study was to explore effect of familial determinants of current smoking, it is important to include other factors that have been researched to have a role in determining current smoking status: For instance what about parents’ smoking status, peer smoking status, second hand smoke exposure at home or other places, family socioeconomic position etc. Why were such important socio-demographic determinants missed from analyses, when they should have been used to see adjusted effect of the familial determinants?
Answer: We agree with you about the important role of mentioned determinants in current smoking of young people, therefore our survey did not include questions about parents' and peers' smoking and other smoking related environmental factors. From the other hand, there are many studies (e.g. ESPAD), which confirmed the associations. Our study was focused on the specific psychosocial familial determinants aiming to assess their impact on young people smoking risk.
In regard to family socioeconomic position, however, in the corrected manuscript we introduced a family affluence scale (FAS) measure to adjust more adequately the studied sample of adolescents' families.

Comment 2:
The authors used Forward steps wise likelihood ratio method. Although some variables would have become insignificant at multivariable level, it would still be important to see the adjusted effect even if they became insignificant. Kindly run multivariable logistic regression analysis, with all study variables included at univariate level, and provide ORs in the results, and tables.
Answer: Done

Minor Essential Revisions:

Comment 1
Line 122: Total n was 5730, 0.5% were excluded due to non-report of smoking status. Final data comes as 3696. How many 11 years old participants were excluded? (You need to justify how, final data set comes to 3696). Secondly, researchers report that participants aged 11 years old were excluded because current smoking prevalence was low in this group. Please provide figures.
Answer: The comment was taken into consideration. The corrected text is: "The present study includes 3696 students aged 13- and 15-years and who reported about current
smoking (the proportion of non-reported current smoking cases was 0.5%, N=19). The youngest group of 11-year-old adolescents (N=2015) was excluded from the analysis because the proportion of current smokers in this group was relatively low (2.3%).

**Comment 2**

*Line 20: Instead of writing anonymous questionnaire, you may mention here that standard HBSC international questionnaire was translated into Lithuanian.*

**Answer:** The comment was taken into consideration. The corrected text is: "A standard HBSC international questionnaire was translated into Lithuanian and used anonymously to obtain information about current smoking patterns and family life (family structure, quality of communication in family, parental monitoring, bonding, parenting style, family time, etc.)."

**Comment 3**

*Line 23: Briefly add what statistical methods were used, and how results are reported.*

**Answer:** Because of limited space in the abstract we consider that mentioning of logistic regression analysis only in statistical methods is adequate. Unconsciously, this method outlines how results must be reported.

**Comment 4**

*Line 24: Results too lengthy for abstract, just mention important ones here: current smoking prevalence, and adjusted ORs of important familial factors only.*

**Answer:** According to your advice, this section was shortened mentioning current smoking prevalence, and adjusted ORs of important familial factors only.

**Comment 5**

*Line 24: report results of multivariate regression analysis in standard format: OR, 95% CI, p-value. Same applies for results section of manuscript as well.*

**Answer:** The comment was taken into consideration, but we did not reported p-value as 95% CI is quite informative characteristic of significance.

**Comment 6**

*Line 35: Rephrase for protective role of the determinants mentioned here.*

**Answer:** Conclusions in the abstract were edited as follows: "Higher prevalence of smoking among adolescents of Lithuania is associated with a non-intact family structure as well as weaker parental support and bonding. Family life practices are critical components to be incorporated in prevention and intervention programs for adolescent smoking in Lithuania."

**Comment 7**

*Line 100: It is mentioned that “data is obtained….”. Please state clearly in abstract and methods section, if it is secondary analysis.*

**Answer:** The indicated statement was re-phrased as follows: "The data analysed here were collected in the school-based ...".

**Comment 8**
Line 106: Age categories in table are simply 13 years old and 15 years old. Methods indicate 11 to 15 years old participants were included. It would be better to term the categories more specifically using # and # signs.

**Answer:** According to the international study protocol, 11-, 13-, and 15 year-old participants were surveyed, but due to relatively low (2.3%) proportion of smokers in the youngest group (among the 11-year-old adolescents) this group (N=2015) was excluded from the present analysis. We think age groups are described quite clearly. The second reviewer has not commented this issue.

**Comment 9**
**Line 105-106:** Simplify and state the study aimed to explore health behaviours among adolescents aged between …. and …. Years. No need to mention mean ages here.
**Answer:** Done.

**Comment 10**
**Line 139 onwards:** I feel, the elaborated text of the familial determinants discussed here may be simplified by presenting as a table referred as “Operationalization of study variables”. Include columns as follows:
- **Variable**
- **Question in survey**
- **Survey response options**
- **Labels used after recoding**

**Answer:** In the first version of the manuscript we have had already tried to summarize outcome variable and its determinants in a table. However, the table was extremely large because there were 51 questions with different response options in survey. A simple description of studied variables, we consider, is shorter and reasonable.

**Comment 11**
**Line 334:** Cite reference studies in square brackets only, please remove “eg.” and round brackets.
**Answer:** Done.

**Comment 12**
**Line 337:** Instead of the word “besides”, do you mean to say: As far as familial determinants of current smoking are concerned.

**Answer:** This sentence was rephrased as follows: "We assessed the statistical significance of associations with current smoking for at least 15 determinants, which measured different aspects of child-parent relationships".

**Comment 13**
**Line 340:** Rephrase as: In order to avoid effect overestimation of the father's or mother's role in single-parent and step-parent families, an intact family was selected as a model to obtain valid findings [39]. (remove the next line).

**Answer:** We have rephrased the sentence, but have not removed the next line to underline Recker's research.
Comment 14
Line 342: has been was?, line 345: sentence ending with “into”, line 386: first at all:
Please revise entire manuscript extensively for language errors.
Answer: The indicated errors are eliminated. We revised the entire manuscript for language errors as much as possible extensively.

Comment 15
Line 348: 82.7% (with a comma). Please thoroughly revise manuscript before submission.
Answer: The manuscript was revised thoroughly, edited, and checked for an incorrect spelling.

Comment 16
Line 351: Avoid bringing back ORs in discussion section. Instead use terms like: were ... times more likely, or had higher odds of smoking etc.
Answer: The comment was taken into account.

TO REVIEWER 2 Renata Kuciene

We would like to thank you for your positive evaluation of our manuscript and indication of the following mistakes:

Add a percentage sign (11.3% to 21.5%) in the Introduction section (44 line).
Use P<0.05 instead of P<.05 (280 line).
Include the abbreviations used in the text to the list of abbreviations: for example, HBSC, FDM II, OR, CI.
Answer: All indicated errors are corrected.