Reviewer's report

Title: Mobile Phone Radiation Health Risk Controversy: The reliability and sufficiency of science behind the safety standards

Version: 2 Date: 17 January 2010

Reviewer: Horacio Riojas

Reviewer's report:

In my opinion this version of the manuscript has significant improvements, is clearer and contains important new information specially those related with the review of epidemiological studies. The arguments are presented in a better way to support the conclusions and the author’s position regarding the standards recommended for the of cell phones.

I only have a comment related to the affirmation that the author make on the epidemiological method. The author says that

Epidemiological studies are considered as the most important in evaluation of human health risk. However, due to their low sensitivity in detecting health effects within the population, epidemiology alone is unlikely to be able to conclusively determine whether weak stimulus, such as mobile phone radiation, causes cancer or other ailment. Besides the low sensitivity of this method, there are numerous biases that affect health risk estimation by epidemiology, such as: selection bias, misclassification bias, recall bias, and the effect of the developing disease on mobile phone use (8).

To support this, the author refers to the study published by Kundi. However, the comments of this author are related to the epidemiological studies that have been published on the use of cell phones and not for the epidemiological method in general. I think that this should be clarified, otherwise the reader have the impression that these commentaries are related to the epidemiological method istelf.
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