

Misclassification of smoking habits. An updated review of the literature.

by Janette S Hamling, Katharine J Coombs and Peter N Lee

Reply to comments of the two reviewers

We thank the two reviewers for their comments on our paper (World Journal of Meta-Analysis Manuscript 44816) and for the time they spent reading it.

Below we reproduce their comments in bold followed by our reply in normal font.

Reviewer #1 (02460781): This article updated a meta-analysis of evidence on accuracy of reported smoking, using cotinine as a marker. The authors present a detailed review of the evidence. This is a good manuscript on such issue.

We are glad that the reviewer thought it to be a good manuscript. No changes to the manuscript have been made as a result of this reviewer's comments as none were suggested.

Reviewer #2 (03077466): This manuscript described an updated review of literature concerning misclassification of smoking habits. It is an interesting story; however, there are some problems for consideration. 1. The manuscript needs to be further edited, especially, you should reorganize the results of the study. 2. More explanations are needed for the rationale of the study design.

We would like to thank the reviewer for motivating our revision of the paper.

1. It is difficult to reorganise the results substantially because, having defined eleven rates, we need to report results for each of them. However, we have added some clarifications to the Results section and the Tables:

- Several small changes have been made to the Results text to make it easier to read.
- The initial description of Variation in rates by other factors has been revised.
- The heading for Table 2 has been expanded to better link it with the text.

- The heading for Table 3 has been changed to clarify its content and its link with Table 2.
- The heading for Table 4 has been changed to reflect the revisions in the text.
- Table 5 has been reworked to give clearer information and to give a better explanation of the structure and meaning of the table.

2. We have expanded the sections on study inclusion criteria and misclassification rates to include explanations of the choice of cotinine ranges and the rates:

- In Study inclusion criteria, detail has been added on how the cotinine ranges for Cut 1 and Cut 2 were chosen.
- In Methods: Misclassification rates, some explanation has been added to the Rate definitions.
- In Methods: Misclassification rates, an explanation has been added for the choice of cut point when more than one is available within a study.

All the changes made are evident from the red-lined revised version submitted with these comments.