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**Reviewer's report:**

Minor Essential Revisions

I would like to see a reference for a recent meta-analysis concerning the effect of maternal age using individual data included into the paper.

(Cardwell CR, et al., Maternal age at birth and childhood type 1 diabetes: a pooled analysis of 30 observational studies. Diabetes 2009(Epub);PMID:19875616.)

What is the reason you have chosen only 1083 controls and not all children (~139,000) without diabetes and using unconditional logistic regression? I am aware that this approach will not dramatically increase the power but in light of somewhat “weak” p-values for the effect of smoking it may corroborate these findings. Furthermore, this approach has been chosen in quite a few other papers (see e.g. the Cardwell reference).

“Continuous variables were grouped into categories for analysis.”

Using categories is used very often because it allows simple description of the effect. Nevertheless, have you tried including continuous variables as continuous and thereby avoiding artificial group boundaries? Even if the results are same, this could be included into section results just by one sentence stating that both type of models coincide.

Furthermore, continuous variables allow easier inclusion of interaction terms.
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