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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions - none

Minor Essential Revisions -
The Methods section of the Abstract and the Statistical Methods section both use the term "matched" or "matching variables" and then note that unconditional logistic regression and "adjustment/stratification" was used. If the matching was pairwise, then conditional logistic regression would have been preferred. If not, then the authors might use the term "frequency matching" to describe the method and justify unconditional logistic regression.

Discretionary Revisions -
In the Strengths and Limitations section, third paragraph (p. 17), the authors comment of the response rate in controls from another study (the Interphone study). This is a tangential comparison that might be moved to the section called "Results from Other Studies" or left out altogether.

Minor Issues not for Publication-
In the Background section, first paragraph, the term "well-demarked" should be "well-demarcated."
In the section on Wireless technology, second paragraph, the phrase "very common overtaking telephones" should be "very common and are overtaking telephones. . ."
In the section on Inclusion criteria, first paragraph, the phrase "and the whole Sweden" should be "the whole of Sweden. . ." In the same paragraph, the phrase "Sweden contains of six administrative . . ." should be "Sweden contains six administrative . . ." In the Results section, final paragraph, the phrase "statistically significant per year. . ." should be "statistically significantly per year. . ."
In the Strengths and limitations section, final paragraph, the word "technique" or "techniques" should be "technology" or "technologies" in referring to the changing transmission systems.
In the Conclusions paragraph, the phrase "taking the long latency periods" might be clearer if it was "considering the long latency periods. . ."
Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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