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Dear Editor! Dear Reviewers!
Thank you again for your comments, we revised our manuscript regarding the two minor issues and we attached a point-by-point response. We also checked the manuscript once more to be ensured that it confirms to all points in regard to the checklist for manuscript formatting.
Best Regards, J. Schröttner

Reviewer's report

Reviewer: Martin Roosli

Reviewer's report:
The paper has markedly improved and there are only two minor issues left that should be considered.

1. Last sentence of the abstract (conclusions):
   In my view the authors should be more specific and refer to non-specific symptoms. Thus the last sentence should be changed as follows:
   “The results show that concerns about EMF did not decrease with time in spite of scientific studies and health risk assessments concluding that a causal relationship of EMF below recommended reference levels AND NON-SPECIFIC SYMPTOMS would be implausible.”

   The wording in the abstract was changed as recommended. (see text)

2. Introduction:
   I acknowledge the extensive investigations of the authors with EHS groups. However, in my view there is still no theoretical basis to conclude that electro-sensitivity is a necessary precondition for EHS. As long as objective criteria for EHS have not been established, one cannot know what exactly is involved with being EHS. I encourage the authors to phrase this paragraph a little bit more cautiously.

   As discussed in the last review, this statement is based on extensive investigations at different EHS groups; however we rephrased this text passage. (see text)