

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** Mortality among US employees of a large computer manufacturing company -- 1969-2001

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 15 August 2006

**Reviewer:** andrew watterson

### Reviewer's report:

General

1. The question posed is new and, within the external constraints that apply, is well defined. This is a very important study that merits publication because of its relatively novel use of unusual data and because the topic covered, is a matter of significant public health importance that should be placed in the public domain to contribute to a wider debate, technical and public interest, about this industry
2. The methods are appropriate and well described. As much detail as possible has been supplied by the author although the disclosure of the data occurred in relatively unusual circumstances. Within the limits of the data set available, limits imposed on the researcher by those supplying the data, it should be possible to replicate the study settings. The author has been careful to identify how the data have been further refined and analysed for the purposes of the paper
3. Data, within the limits already mentioned, are sound and as well controlled as they can be. The authors identify the limits of these controls
4. The study is unique. Within the external constraints, the manuscript adheres to appropriate standards for reporting and data deposition and specifically highlights the need for data sets such as these to be far more widely available for scientific scrutiny
5. The discussion is well balanced and the conclusions are supported adequately by the data available
6. The title and abstract do reflect the findings
7. The writing is acceptable.

I do not see the need for any revisions to the paper as it now stands.

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Accept after discretionary revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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