Reviewer’s report

Title: Familial determinants of current smoking among adolescents of Lithuania: a cross-sectional survey 2014

Version: 3 Date: 16 May 2015

Reviewer: Syeda Kanwal Kanwal

Reviewer’s report:

Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
Are the data sound? Yes
Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Please see added comments.
Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes.
Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.
Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Please see added comments.
Is the writing acceptable? Needs extensive revision before being published.

Major Compulsory Revisions

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?

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.

Minor Essential Revisions:

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.

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

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

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

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.


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

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.

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

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

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

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

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)

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.

15. Line 348: 82,7% (with a comma). Please thoroughly revise manuscript before submission.

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.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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