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Reviewer's report:

In this study, the authors conducted a cross-sectional study to assess Waterpipe and cigarette tobacco smoking among Palestine University Students. I commend the authors for their work, however I have several reservations about the study. I have included my comments in detail below:

1. The authors do not present a substantive argument about why it is important to study WTS smoking in Palestine university students. Are the rates really higher? I suggest the authors to read the paper by Khalid and colleagues that estimated the burden of WTS, cigarette and dual smoking in Arab nations; and draw rationale about their study.

2. The main concern is use of GATS for university students. What is age range of these students? Are they >18 years old?

3. The questions on WTS use from GATS are limited. No question about frequency, waterpipe heads etc. were present in the GATS questionnaire. I suggest the authors read Alzyoud et al. paper published in GJHS for Arabic version of waterpipe tobacco questionnaire. Primack et al. has also come up with a similar questionnaire.

4. The sample size calculations ignored the sampling strategy and the analytical strategy. Please check.

5. Another major concern is "dual smokers". The authors have conveniently avoided defining dual tobacco smokers i.e., those who smoke both waterpipe and cigarettes.
6. Analysis plan: mean and SD; and median and interquartile range. You should not report SD for medians.

7. Use of logistic regression models for estimating prevalence and prevalence ratios is not advisable without mentioning limitations about survival bias.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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