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The editor,
BioMed Central,

Subject: Second revised submission of MS: 1231406977103996 - Prevalence of and factors associated with asthma in adult male leather tannery workers in Karachi, Pakistan: A cross sectional study.

Dear Editor,
Please find below the responses to the comments made to the above mentioned manuscript.

Thank you and best regards,

Dr Khurram Shahzad
MBBS, MS
Comments by Eva Anderson  
Version: 2 Date: 7 October 2006  

General  
This paper on asthma among leather tannery workers in Pakistan has been revised and most of the issues raised have been answered and changes have been made.

-----------------------------------------------  
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)  

Abstract 3d paragraph row 7: "For" should be removed to make the sentence correct. Should be "Those who..."

Response: Suggested modifications have been done.

Comment on the new text page 3, 2nd paragraph: I'm not convinced from the literature that skin problems usually is a stage in development of asthma from chromium and would suggest a weaker word on row 4, instead of "appears to be" use "could be" or something similar to that. As nothing is said in the paper about COPD I will also suggest to change row 7 to "those of respiratory tract and skin".

Response: I have changed it to "could be".

COPD I will also suggest to change row 7 to "those of respiratory tract and skin".

Response: This has been changed accordingly as well.

page 3, parag 3, row 2, word 9 studies instead of study
Response: The error has been removed now.

page 4, parag 2, row 1, should be Korangi industrial area
Response: This has been corrected.

page 6, parag 4, row 3 "biologically meaningfully" is questionable, should need further explanation and I suggest that it will be removed.

Response: We have removed “biologically meaningful”

What next? Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests
Comments by Paul Cullinan
Version: 2 Date: 29 September 2006

General
This manuscript is a considerable improvement on the earlier version. I am disappointed that the authors have chosen not to consider work-related asthma separately - and frankly unimpressed by their justification for not doing so. Subjective reports of work-related asthma are used extensively and generally have a reasonable level of specificity. I suspect that other readers will feel similarly. My comment about the distributions of some variables was made simply to suggest that those without a normal distribution (such as income) are better expressed as medians (range) than by mean and standard deviation - an index which of course has no meaning for skewed distributions.

Response: We have added information on “income range” now as suggested by the referee.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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)
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