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Reviewer's report:

This research article aimed to evaluate demographic differences in smokefree policies enacted in the United States prior to 2014, for both adults and Children. The demographic variables include ethnicity, region, income and education. Although significant differences in coverage of smokefree policies were found among the four variables, the findings lacked of novelty. The authors used secondary analyses that extend or replicate published findings without adding substantial knowledge. In other words, the study reported already known knowledge that is predictable. The findings have no clinical and theoretical implications for the other researchers in the same field.

Although some public health researchers did emphasize the importance of health inequalities on public health, the findings that are of interest to a very narrow or specialized audience that study smoking policies. The article may be simply a small extension of a different paper. The work is seemed to be a part of a larger study, chopped up to make as many articles as possible. The used measurements were incomprehensive that made it marginal interest of the field of smoking policies. The study is not exciting and fresh. Although the topic of the study is important, it did not place in a broader context. There were numerous reasons to influence the coverage of smokefree space policies except of ethnicity, region, income and education.

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.

Unable to assess

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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