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Reviewer’s report:

Introduction is weedy.

Line 50-54. The second half of the paragraph is supported by a year 2009 reference, whereas the initial part of the paragraph says it differently i.e. "Some limited protections were implemented in 2014". Can you elaborate it with the written OSH laws? Can you confirm from there that there is no written law or at least ministerial statement regarding ionizing radiations omission? I have come across the WHO factsheet where they have established radiation programs in accordance with member states. Please reconfirm either the statement (line 52-54) is still valid considering the reference is approximately 9 years old?

Gap Identification is not properly highlighted.

Line 55-59. Shows different health related outcomes of flight crew. The mixed findings as the researcher stated doesn't mean "it's a gap in literature" as written in the start of line no 60. Can you draw a table of at least 5 most recent studies and highlight the gap from there? I believe mixed findings shows the inconclusiveness in past studies only. Please highlight in the table about what is missing in those studies and what different you are doing in this research. In this way you will be clearly able to highlight the importance of this study along with what different steps you are doing.

Another concern related to gap identification: The environmental/physical/situational factors with their effects on health related outcomes of cabin crew members will definitely be different in comparison to general public. How the authors address this issue? The health conditions on the basis of such factors can be compared if the people/workers work in the similar or somewhat related field. In this case cabin crews falls in the service industry category. It will be fair enough to do the comparison of their health with any other related service industry workers. For instance, the health of the workers (on the basis of such factors) who works in the hazardous working environment such as petroleum industry can be compared with the health of the workers working in another hazardous working environment industry like construction, agriculture etc. because to some extent of similar work environment conditions. Please have a look on it.

Methodology is simple.
The analyses are very simple. Please use the state-of-the-art techniques i.e. second generation techniques in accordance with the objective of the study.

I hope, with the help of such changes the paper content will be more strong.

Good luck.
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