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Reviewer's report:

Comments to the revised version of Liu et al: exposure to 3G mobile phone…..
The paper has now been revised but it is still in need of some additional revisions (Minor Essential Revisions) before it can be accepted for publication, see below.

The SAR values should be given already in the abstract.
Key words: mobile phone already in title, suggest change to cell phone

Page 3, introduction: On line 10 add a new ref to also malignant tumours, for example:
This paper is now refered as number 14 in the text; should moved to line 10 to read (10, 14).

Line 12: ref to Hardell et al ref 14 is NOT about lacking increase in rates; change to another ref showing increased rates: Lennart Hardell * and Michael Carlberg, Increasing Rates of Brain Tumours in the Swedish National Inpatient Register and the Causes of Death Register. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2015, 12, 3793-3813; doi:10.3390/ijerph120403793.

Page 5, line 24. Insert the explanation given in the response to the reviewer about how the SAR was calculated. Give both peak SAR as well as average SAR over 10 g. I still object to the use of two decimals for an averaged value like this. One is more than enough here.

Page 5 line 26. I still want to know the magnetic field in the incubator and if this was homogenous in the incubator. I know this is not what is studied but uneven background magnetic field could be a factor to take into account. See further:

Page 13 line 2: EMF is NOT just caused by Mobile telephony. We do have electricity in our homes and this is the main cause of general EMF. If you change to Radiofrequency electromagnetic field then it is more correct instead of a general EMF statement.