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Reviewer’s report:

General
Authors investigated 600 of office workers to clarify the relationship between VDT work and dermatological symptoms. As the results, they found higher prevalence of dermatological symptoms in VDT workers. I think this result is interesting for the researchers of occupational medicine, ergonomics and others. However, I think some revisions are needed for an acceptance of this article.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. Authors should show the statistical method they used. How were the effects of the confounding factors excluded? In addition, what were the confounding factors; gender, age or amount of VDT use? I think two-way or three-way ANOVA or ANCOVA was needed.
2. Authors should explain or discuss the differences of results between previous studies and theirs in the section of Discussion.
   Also, if possible, the mechanism of the effect of VDT use on dermatological symptoms should be discussed in the section of Discussion.
3. I suggest authors to perform a trend test for Table 4 such as Cochran-Armitage test. I hope there is a significant positive trend.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. There are many spelling mistakes and others. Proof reading by native speaker of English is needed.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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