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Severity and susceptibility: measuring the perceived effectiveness and believability of tobacco health warnings

The manuscript examines how the severity of the content of health warning labels influences responses to them. The authors find that pictorial HWLs are rated as more effective and believable than text-only warning that was already demonstrated. The main finding is that the results provide some support for the use of severe HWLs on tobacco products.

This is an interesting and clearly written manuscript. The results are relevant since the authors have found that HWLs should aim to increase perceived susceptibility to disease.

I have only a few comments to the manuscript that I present below:
* It would be interesting to know the process of selection of the illnesses shown in the HWLs. Why where selected this three diseases and no other ones? Did you rate a determinate number of diseases to decide which affect more to their susceptibility? Maybe a explanation of the procedure would be helpful.
* In this way, it would be interesting to know your suggestions or way to proceed to decide which diseases are highly susceptible for smokers.
* About collecting data from a convenience sample, are you planning to collect data from a different population that has lower level of education and income? As you already suggest, this should strengthen the information and would be exportable to the general population.

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

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**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:
Acceptable
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