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Reviewer's report:

I think the authors have responded well and thoroughly to the previous comments but I still have some remaining minor concerns.

1. The background feels quite long and repeats a mass of statistics, some old and contradictory eg reference 5 is I think 2007 and the data is not coherent with the rest paragraph. Authors to see if their section could be more streamlined and tell a better story.

2. Page 15 lines 348-53 it is not completely clear from this paragraph that participants have to register with the programme - the text refers to expressing interest. The primary outcome described on page 19 uses the numbers registering as the denominator. I think it would be at least equally important to know how many people after hearing about the programme don't go on to register. Otherwise the true generalisability to the target population of smokers won't be known, and predicting recruitment for a future trial will not be fully informed. If this data is not easily available could a theoretical denominator be calculated based on the known prevalence of smokers, numbers of women registered for medical services in eligible practices known to smoke etc.

3. Page 18 lines need clarifying. Is the standard control programme already being offered? Have these centers been identified. Who is the deliverer? This links to last paragraph on this page.

4. Page 16 lines 376- I'm not sure what it means when it says practitioners will be informed of the support programme they will receive, who are the practitioners, don't they deliver the programme?

5. Page 19 lines 453-8 need rewording to integrate newly inserted text better

6. Page 19 line 460 this implies registration has to be on web page. This is not clear from previous

7. Page 21 line 515 what criteria are used for purposive sampling?

8. Page 22 start of this page needs to clear this no longer about interviews. The completion of the checklist appears to be a self assessment by the CFs, so is not sufficiently objective
9. Finally the paper feels very long and I wonder if some of the text could be written more succinctly especially the sections from dissemination onwards
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