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Dear Sir or Madam,

“Are passive smoking and air pollution a greater mortality risk than major radiation incidents?” MS: 8907299781108847

I enclose my responses to the second set of referees’ comments on the above manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Jim Smith
Response to referees’ comments – Part II.

Are passive smoking and air pollution a greater mortality risk than major radiation incidents?

MS: 8907299781108847
Dr. J.T. Smith

I again thank the referees for their thorough reviews and useful comments. The first referee had no further comments on the manuscript. I will respond here to the second referee’s new comments following my first revision of the manuscript.

Response to general comments.

The referee makes some important general points here, many of which I agree with. But I do not believe that they are relevant criticisms of this paper. As noted several times in the paper, and in my response to the referee’s previous comments, this analysis is necessarily focused on one important consequence of radiation incidents, namely the long term stochastic mortality risk from radiation exposures. The paper does not intend to give a full review of the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. As a contributing scientist to the Chernobyl Forum, I am well aware of the important social and psychological consequences of the accident and of the serious non-fatal diseases following radiation exposures: these are referred to in the manuscript either directly, or in the cited literature.

Response to specific comments.

I have revised the manuscript in response to some, but not all, of the referee’s comments. In some cases the referees suggestions raised new issues which I believe are outside the scope of the paper. In some other cases, I did not think that the referee’s suggestions for changes improved the content or clarity of the manuscript. However, in many cases I agree with the referee’s suggestions and have incorporated the changes in the revised manuscript.