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Dear Editor—in-chief:

Enclosed is the manuscript by Sabik et al. titled **Car dio-toxicity of Freon among Refrigeration Services Workers: comparative cross-sectional study**. 

*after doing the recommended corrections.*

This manuscript is being submitted to you for possible publication in the "Environmental Health Journal".

The authors hope from publishing this research in your respectable journal to arouse scientists, employers and workers especially in developing countries about the possible cardiac hazards of Freon to take the corrective actions needed.

Sincerely,

Dr. Laila Sabik, MD

[Lailasabik714@hotmail.com](mailto:Lailasabik714@hotmail.com)

Assistant Professor of Clinical Toxicology

Zagazig University

Sharkia Governorate, Egypt
Manuscript contents:

1- Title page.
2- Abstract
3- Background.
4- Methods.
5- Results.
6- Discussion
7- Conclusion
8- List Of Abbreviation
9- Competing interests
10- Authors' contributions.
11- Acknowledgment
12- References
13- Legend figures (4 figures).
14- List of table (3 tables)
N.B.
15- Figures will uploaded as a separate 4 files.

The recommended corrections.

I will pass step by step from the 1st page till the end of the manuscript to clarify the required recommended corrections which implemented in the manuscript.

Editorial team comments:

On the cover page,

the title information that this is a cross-sectional study should be listed as a subtitle after a colon.

Ok, this done

Please remove the period after the title and the author names.

I remove the period after the title and the author names.

Background chapter requirements:

Editorial team comments:

On page 5, in-coordination is not a word, perhaps lack of coordination?
This word is removed when I summarized the background

Reviewer's one comments

Background chapter should be shortened

Ok, the background chapter was summarized.

Methodology sections requirements:
Please state how the workers were contacted?
(Workers were contacted through an official letter from dean of our faculty(faculty of medicine, zagazig university ,Egypt) to the head of Suez Canal Authority) who arranged our meeting to workers in their workshop and also our meeting with Dr Safwat Al-Refaey ,the cardiologist who responsible for cheek up of the workers ,who participate us in the research work.

*Please clarify whether written informed consent was obtained, and whether the study protocol was approved by an ethical review committee.
Yes, we cleared that in the manuscript
reasons for non-participation, and the participation rate.?
we explain this point in the manuscript.

*you don't need to indicate the general references to justify why you included covariates.

The references of covarities are deleted from methodology part.

Please also state whether the 24-hour Holter monitoring included a work day for all participants (also the control group).
Yes, we cleared that in the manuscript
You can leave out the explanation of arrhythmia.
Ok, this done
Holter monitoring

Editorial team comments
Holter monitoring, please describe the quality assurance, i.e. how you made sure that a missed beat was not just a technical problem, but a true indication of arrhythmia.

Reviewer's one comments
Methods chapter. The dysrhythmias searched should be given more detailed: Ventricular dysryth-mias only?

Reviewer's two comments:
Holter monitoring; it should be good to have a more detailed description about how you recorded the electrocardiogram like electrodes used (name, company), how you analyzed the results
The part of holter monitoring in methodology was written in detailed to cover all recommended requirements .

Editorial team comments
Blood analytical results should be provided in uniform units. We prefer SI units on a molar basis, when appropriate, and at least a conversion factor must be provided.
Ok, conversion factor is provided in methodology part and SI units on a molar basis are provided in the tables .

Leave out the paragraph saying that you did not conduct biological monitoring.

Ok, this done

Reviewer's two comments on methodology
Urinary markers; please add companies for the test stripes and ORG 5 BM test used.
Ok, this done
Environmental assessment; please add reference for the GC-MS method and company for the charcoal tubes.

Ok, this done

Results sections requirements:
Editorial team comments on results section
The Results section should not repeat data that are already presented in the tables. Ok this done
Please use exact p values, not just an indication whether they are below 0.05, both in text and tables. Ok this done

The first sentence on page 14 does not make sense. It is stated that there are no statistically significant differences and then in parenthesis states except... and then lists that the level of urinary B2M was significantly elevated!?? This section would be much clearer if the areas of similarity were grouped together and the difference were also rather than mixing the two. This makes it very confusing.

Ok, this part is adjusted

Reviewer's one comments
Results. The character of arrhythmias found should be given more detailed

Ok, I cleared that point

Comments on discussion section
Editorial team
Discussion. should be shortened.

Reviewer's one comments
Discussion. this is an exhausting chapter, and should be shortened.

Ok, I summarized the discussion.

Comments on abbreviations section
All abbreviations and their explanation listed alphabetically in a single paragraph.  Ok, this done

Comments on reference section
remove the brackets around the numbers in the reference list
Ok, this done

Comments on tables section

Editorial team comments on tables section
Tables 1 and 2 could be combined, likewise 3 and 4.
Ok
Reviewer's one comments
(Thus Table 5 could be deleted, and the average heart rate could be included in the text.)
Ok, table 5 of holter monitoring removed and replaced by figs 3&4, also mean values of heart rate and abnormal beats are written inside text.

Reviewer's two comments
A variance in table 6 ought to be added.
N.B. (after combined tables and deletion of holter table, become table 3)
Ok, this done

Comments on Statistical analyses section

Reviewer's two comments
Statistical analyses; please add which data is seen as quantitative and which are qualitative.
This explained in statistical part and added at the head of the table

Comments on Authors' contributions section
In regard to Authors' contributions, please refer to a previously published article for proper wording.
Ok, this done

**Comments on figures section**

Figures should not repeat information already given in the tables.
Figures 4 and 5 are clearly not needed.
we don't accept figures 2A and 2B.
All figures should be sequentially numbered,
**Ok, Figures 4 and 5 & figures 2A and 2B are deleted.**
*we add figs 3&4 as Reviewer's one asked*

(A figure representing a mean of the occurrence of extra-systolia during patients in Freon exposure and without Freon exposure should be made instead of two individual examples (because there was a statistical difference in t-test, the difference should be found also in mean values). This figure could also include the mean results of the non exposed controls. )

Finally figures are sequentially numbered.

**Linguistic comments:**

Some linguistic editing will be needed

Editing revision are already done
This manuscript would greatly improve if the author could summarize more points,
give less description and focus on the key aspects of the study and its findings..?

**Truly, we try to follow all recommended instruction, in addition to languishing corrections all over the manuscript and we hop that our efforts achieve your requirements and acceptance.**