

## **Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Occupational Exposures and Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma: Canadian Case-Control Study

**Version: 2 Date:** 8 July 2008

**Reviewer:** Pierluigi Cocco

### **Reviewer's report:**

The revised version looks much better. However, there are still a few minor points that need to be corrected.

1. From the authors' response to the reviewers' comments, it looks clear that the term radium is used to define exposure to "ionizing radiation" of whatever undefined type. To comply with standard definitions in the scientific literature, the authors should replace "radium" with "ionizing radiation" throughout the paper.
2. Missing word: perhaps "agricultural" in front of occupations in line 12 of the introduction.
3. Briefly remind what was the response rate in cases and controls. For controls, give the response rate for the total control group, as well as for population and hospital controls separately.
4. First line on page six.. List here what were the adjusting covariates retained in the log regression model.
5. Show number of cases and controls in each category of duration in Table 3.
6. The results for all the exposures that were analyzed should be reported in Table 4, along with the number of exposed cases and controls, and not only those showing a positive finding.
7. Page 7, first line of third paragraph. "...the results of a multivariate conditional logistic regression models..."

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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