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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract:
1. The abstract is concise and generally a good summary of the paper.

Introduction:
1. The rationale of this study seems to be under-develop. It is not clear to me why the authors chose to replicate the Northern Sweden study in the first place. Is it because of the differences in SES characteristics (such as education level and birth country) and dietary patterns, including type of fish intake and cooking methods? To me, the populations from these two regions are similar. Providing overview of fish intake patterns in Southern Sweden study may be useful.

Material and methods:
1. The authors provide a good description of their methods. However, it may be useful to describe whether the study has made use of any memory aids such as colour photographs, and whether questionnaire has clearly defined what lean/fat fishes are to avoid information bias.
2. It is better to include the male/female ratio of the subjects even sex-specific analyses were done.

Results:
1. The number of case/control in each exposure category should be reported (may be in table format).
2. Have you checked the dose response effect, especially in fat fish intake?
3. Report if sensitivity analysis is done to handle the recall bias.

Discussion:
1. The authors should discuss more about the crudeness of fish consumption categories used in this study. The frequency of meal intake is not necessary the same as the amount of fish consumption.
2. Perhaps more details regarding the generalisability (external validity) of the study results for international interest.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Introduction, page 2, 1st paragraph: “life-style related factors” should be “lifestyle-related factors”.

2. Introduction, page 2, 2nd paragraph: suggest to replace “geography” with “geographic regions/areas”.

3. Material and methods, page 3, 1st paragraph: “life style factors” should be “lifestyle factors”; also “response-rate” should be “response rate”.
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