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Dear Dr Pemberton

Thank you for your continuing concern of my paper. I also appreciate the many constructive comments from Dr. Cockwell; they have certainly improved the paper.

Here are my responses to Dr. Cockwell:

1. The search included all hydrocarbons commonly used in the industry and with putative toxicity. The text has been changed accordingly.
2. The section Findings for individual hydrocarbons have been taken away.
3. I have added comments about the different patterns seen in different animals in the Discussion section.
4. To include the suggested table with information about the degree of exposure of workers to each individual hydrocarbon lies beyond my expertise. Specialists in occupational medicine should certainly study this problem, but I think that the issue is not relevant for my paper. What I have shown is that hydrocarbons are able to cause glomerulonephritis in mammals and therefore most likely in human beings also. This is a crucial piece of information, considering the widespread scepticism among nephrologists against this hypothesis (which should not be seen as a hypothesis any longer) and considering the large number of patients that are in danger of ending in end-stage renal failure as long as no preventive measures are made due to the mentioned scepticism. The suggested table would demand much work by me (if I am able to do it at all) and delay the spread of this important information with at lest a year if not more.
5. To expand the table with separate columns for IM and EM would demand separate columns also for LM and for additional comments as these four items are included in the same column. Thus, the table would become much broader and very difficult to read on most computers. It would also be impossible to print on paper of ordinary size. Hopefully you can accept that I have kept the original table.

In the beginning of the Discussion I have added a comment about the use of Freund’s adjuvant. I have also changed the text a little here and there, but only for linguistic reasons.

Hopefully you can accept the manuscript in its present form.

Yours sincerely

Uffe Ravnskov