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Reviewer's report:

General

This is an interesting study of ABR changes after EMF exposure from the mobile phone. The conspicuous point of this paper is that they did not replicate their own results reported previously. No effects were observed on the ABR response latencies. They are consistent with the previous results reported by other groups. It is important that wrong results were corrected by the original authors. I have a few comments to be considered by the authors.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

ABR responses shown in the figure are poor. Even though they are grand average data, responses are not good. I some of them, I waves are not clearly detected. In recordings with poor I waves, we can not judge central nervous system function well. This may because the sound was not given correctly or because some problems in ear or because some problems recording condition of the subjects. From such poor recording data, we may miss some small differences. The authors should reconsider this point.

Why did the authors replicate their previous results? The authors just sais this fact in discussion. The authors should discuss this point more seriously. Some authors in this field often presented some positive data and made problems, and they themselves reported no replication later. These issues should be reconsidered. In this paper, the reasons for no replication should be discussed.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The authors used paired t-test in statistical comparisons. The latencies of waves must have some correlations among them. In such case, t-test appropriate?

There are a few English problems in the text. These should be checked again.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.