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30 October 2012

To: the editors, Environmental Health.

I enclose the final form of an original paper entitled "Microwaves in the Cold War: the Moscow embassy study and its interpretation. Review of a retrospective cohort study." for publication in Environmental Health.

The study has not been published or presented elsewhere.

I have no financial or other conflict of interest.

Changes to the final manuscript are shown in track changes.

The final manuscript has been changed in some details suggested by the editors (e.g. adding the study design to the title, and some other details).

The tables have had minor changes in format, not in content. Table 3 has been revised to make it shorter. These tables are given as separate Word files.

The manuscript has been edited further to clarify some points, but the content has not been changed.

The comments of reviewer 2 have been carefully considered; her points are numbered in your e-mail of 25 Oct. In response:

1. The abstract has been revised following these suggestions.

2. I have checked carefully to ensure I have the right to publish this review. The original report is in the Johns Hopkins library, and as such is available to the public (library catalog entry is:

Foreign service health status study: evaluation of health status of foreign service and other employees from selected Eastern European posts : final report
Abraham M. Lilienfeld ... [et al.]. Book in English, 1978
Stack Level 5, Welch Library Available WA 105 F714 1978 c. 1
https://catalyst.library.jhu.edu/?commit=search&page=3&q=Lilienfeld&search_field=author
I have also contacted the senior living author of the original report, Dr James Tonascia, who is still at Johns Hopkins, who has assured me that the report is available in the library, but has not been published elsewhere.

These points are now noted in the methods section.

3. In her comment numbered 3, the reviewer repeats some main points about the original report. These are consistent with my review, and do not add anything extra.

Later she asks whether the other papers I have commented on are based on a complete review. I have added a sentence to the methods section on the search strategy used; these papers do reflect a systematic review of peer-reviewed sources.

Later the reviewer notes that she read my paper with some interest, and was not aware of the details of the original study. Many experts in the EMF field have made similar comments, which is why I wrote the review. The first reviewer emphasizes his view that publishing this review will be valuable.

Yours sincerely

Mark Elwood