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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, an interesting paper with potential for exploring the use of mindfulness training for smokers provided over the Internet. Thank you for the opportunity of reading your work. I hope the comments and suggestions provided will be useful for the authors.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
None

Minor Essential Revisions:

a. Page 2, paragraph 2 – the authors should include the reference for the parent study so that the reader may review information on the parent population.

b. The references are numbered consecutively, in square brackets, in the text. However, in the “References” section, the references are presented alphabetically by the author’s surname rather than numbered consecutively and this needs to be changed.

c. Page 2, first paragraph, 3rd line – a correction of the line is needed, it states walking eating.

d. Figure 1: There is a difference in the text from what is in the figure (81 vs 98). Also, it would be helpful to change the title of the first box to: Invited to attend the MTSO orientation (and an asterisk included at the bottom of the figure –to include information on being ineligible for the parent study due to scheduling conflicts). Also, it is unclear why the n=22 at the 4-week assessment visit when there are only 20 completers. Please clarify?

e. Table 2 needs revisions – column 1 does not line up with column 2 and the information needs to be defined (i.e., mean and SD not defined).

f. Table 3 needs clarification – Please clarify the numbers in parentheses (66) and (43)??

g. Authors’ contributions – does not provide information on the contribution of the authors.

Discretionary Revisions:

a. Page 1, last paragraph - it would be useful to include the quit rates of the
participants in the Bricker et al, study.

b. It would be helpful to include the start date of the trial (and the length of time taken to recruit participants) in the methods section.

c. Page 2, MTSO – it would be helpful to include information on the quality control methods used for review of phone calls.
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