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To: The editor of BMC Public Health

Bilthoven, 30 May 2011

Dear Editor,

We would like once again to thank you and the reviewers Dr Sabine Heinrich and Professor Martin Röösli for your remarks and feedback that helped us improve our work. We are delighted that our study is accepted and will be published in BMC public health. On behalf of the co-authors I would like to submit the final version of our manuscript with the title “Non-specific physical symptoms in relation to actual and perceived proximity to mobile phone base stations and powerlines.” After your request, I have listed (briefly) below all the final changes we made (in blue colour).

Yours Sincerely,
Christos Baliatsas, MSc
Minor comments by Dr Heinrich:

1) Methods part, page 13, last paragraph:
You wrote: “scored significantly lower on perceived health”. Which statistical test was used to verify the statistical significant differences between responders and non-responders? If p values are not available (as you wrote in author’s response to review), you can add the values from the statistical tests you used.

Only the percentage differences and the level of significance were available (but not the exact p values). As you mentioned, there was a significant difference between responders and non-responders regarding perceived health and also a significant difference in terms of residential satisfaction. The level of significance was p<0.05 in both cases (added to the text).

2) Discussion part, page 19, last paragraph:
You wrote in author’s response to review: “Possible reasons for low response could be the length of the survey questionnaire and the small reward.” I think this sentence should be added to the manuscript.

We added it to the manuscript.

3) Figure 2: The figure would be more clearer for the reader, if the data concerning the non-existing symptoms would be deleted. Then it would be easier to read the frequency of the symptoms.

We agree with your comment but since a large percentage of the sample does not report any symptoms we thought that this should be reflected on the figure.

4) Discussion part, page 19, first paragraph:
In author’s response to review you wrote: “This definition (the definition of vicinity) leaves some room for subjective interpretation and ca be a factor for this poor association (the association between self-reported proximity and geo-coded distance). I think this issue should be also mentioned in the manuscript.

We added it to the manuscript.

- No comments reported by Professor Röösli.

- All the formatting changes (both major and minor) suggested by the editorial office are made.