

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Secondhand smoke in outdoor settings: smokers' consumption, non-smokers' perceptions, and attitudes toward smoke-free legislation in Spain.
AUTHORS	Sureda Lull, Francisca; Fernandez, Esteve; Martínez-Sánchez, Jose; Fu, Marcela; Lopez, Maria; Martínez, Cristina; Saltó, Esteve

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Julianna Pacheco The University of Iowa
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Feb-2015

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The paper "Secondhand Smoke in Outdoor Settings: Smokers' Consumption, Non-Smokers' Perceptions, and Attitudes Towards Smoke-Free Legislation in Spain" is clearly written and aims to describe the current state of smoking behavior and attitudes in Spain after implementation of Law 42/2010. The analyses is clear and appropriate. The descriptive information is also easy to follow. The results are not surprising, but the authors do a nice job of describing the policy implications of their work. In sum, I think this paper is pretty good. My only quibble is that the paper is largely descriptive; thus, there is no real novel findings for our understanding of the policy process or anti-smoking legislation. I defer to the editor and other reviewers, however, for the appropriateness of an article of this kind in this journal. I also two minor comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It was confusing to me to characterize smokes as "not smoking indoor or in outdoors places" (e.g., the first category in Table 1.) Perhaps you can describe this a little more. For instance, where are these smokers smoking then if not indoors or outdoors?2. In the tables with frequencies, I would put the percentages as the main figures and the n in parentheses. Really, the percentages are what the readers are interested in and the large n's mask important differences in frequencies.
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

1. It was confusing to me to characterize smokers as "not smoking indoor or in outdoors places" (e.g., the first category in Table 1.) Perhaps you can describe this a little more. For instance, where are these smokers smoking then if not indoors or outdoors?

We thank the reviewer's comment and we have replaced the term "not smoking indoor or in outdoors places" for "No consumption". We agree with the reviewer that since those people reported to be smokers it sounds quite confusing or strange that those smokers reported then smoking cigarettes neither indoors nor outdoors. However those were the responses to the question "How many cigarettes (per day) do you normally smoke at (home/work/bars and restaurants/discotheques/pubs)?" (Answers were gathered for typical working and non-working days). It could be possible that some daily smokers used to smoke in other places such as in the street, other open spaces or even private places different from home not included in the specific question. But we also included occasional smokers that it is possible they have replied no consumption to that question.

2. In the tables with frequencies, I would put the percentages as the main figures and the n in parentheses. Really, the percentages are what the readers are interested in and the large n's mask important differences in frequencies.

Thanks for the comment. We have made the appropriate changes in the tables.