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Reviewer's report:

This is a relevant study with interesting analyses using logistic regression models plus network data analyses. I must admit that the methodology is outside my expertise, so it is difficult for me to evaluate that part. It seems that reviewer comments were all addressed appropriately. In that sense, I think the paper is now improved.

For me what is confusing is that the terminology used seem deviant from behavior change models. I feel that more elaborations on theoretical models would benefit the introduction and discussion so that the readers better understand the framework used. The placements and definitions of attitudes, social norms, social modeling, social pressure, and intention to smoke (which is the more proximal antecedent of behavior according to many theories) should be more explicit.

As I feel that the methodology used is beyond my expertise, I recommend an additional statistical review. Other than that, I recommend a minor revision.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.

Unable to assess

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 recommend additional statistical review

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