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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have substantially improved the manuscript and it makes an important contribution to the literature.

I have a couple of minor comments.

The last sentence of the abstract is a little bit confusing: "Though former smokers had a higher dietary ED than never smokers, this difference still significantly lower than that of current smokers (p=0.002)." It would seem simpler to include the ED value for them (1.84) and write something like:

"Former smokers had a slightly lower ED value (1.84) than current non-daily smokers (1.89) but a higher value than than never smokers (1.79). In Figure 1, "non-smokers" should be relabeled with "never smokers" which is more clear.

Finally, it seems like an important point that former smokers have a higher ED than never smokers, so this sentence in the discussion should be edited:

"The results also suggest that former smokers have comparable dietary ED to never smokers and better diets than current smokers, including those that only smoke occasionally." to indicate that former smokers have a somewhat higher ED than never smokers; especially as this difference appears statistically significant in figure 1.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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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?
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