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Reviewer's report:

Male Commuters in North and South England: Risk Factors for the Presence of Faecal Bacteria on Hands.

General Comments: This paper is interesting and it appears that the authors have addressed reviewer concerns. However, I have a few concerns with the analysis and presentation of the results.

Compulsory Revisions
Statistical analysis. Since there are four groups of participants based on the cities selected, how can one compare continuous variables using the t-test? They should have been compared using ANOVA.

Table 3. This table is confusing and difficult to interpret. I would suggest that the 308 somehow be included in the table either as 277 non-contaminated or normal flora or CNS or something that would total of 100%.

Table 4. The second column in this table leads me to believe that all 308 participants had contaminated hands. If so, that’s fine but it is very confusing as is. Table 4 and Table 5 could be combined, but as they are now I find them very confusing and difficult to interpret.

Minor Essential Revisions
Questionnaire. Reading this text and comparing it to Table 1 is confusing. Based on the text, I would expect five items to be listed in Table 1, however, there are nine of which four are behavioral. Either they should be briefly mentioned in the text or deleted from the Table.

Results. Third paragraph states, “Contamination risk declined with age …”. It’s not the risk - it’s the odds of contamination.

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.
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