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Reviewer’s report:

General

Thanks to authors for their responses which have clarified the research questions and several other issues including the use of occupational sector as reasonable proxy for socio-economic class.

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

1. Some comment regarding the stability of occupational sector and town size of residence over the follow-up period after 1970 needs to be made in the paper itself (as per the response) irrespective of the observed results for head and neck or the assumed latent period of the disease (which is likely to differ by site).

2. The results for men are still described in both the Abstract and Results as showing a socio-economic class gradient when this is not the case [as per original review, there is a dichotomy in levels of risk (0-III) vs (IV-VIII)]. Also it seems to be inferred in the paper that this occupational sector classification is a hierarchy, so why service jobs classed at IX should be proposed as being in an intermediate socio-economic position in men is not clear. Moreover there is heterogeneity between sites which is not mentioned for men (or women - see below). Please clarify in the paper.

3. The noteworthy results of the assessment in women of the association of socio-economic class with sites of melanoma other than head and neck are neither remarked upon in Results or Abstract nor discussed in the Discussion section, when they should be explicit.

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

4. In the first line of Abstract, “site” should be removed, since cutaneous melanoma is not a site, and in any event the term "site" is reserved for anatomic site in the title and rest of paper.
5. “Trunk” should replace “thorax” throughout the paper, as the latter term is not used in this context.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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