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Reviewer’s report:

The aim of this paper is not clear. Comparing the difference of individual UV exposure between urban population and rural population or evaluation the feasibility of individual UV quantification by polysulfone dosimetry? The key point of the whole paper may be different for different aims. The discussion and the conclusions of present paper do not match.

The authors know that the two cities which participants were involved in are different in latitude. It will be better if the participants were collected from both urban and rural areas in the same city.

Abstract:

There is a mistake in line 7-8. Both locations are rural location.

Methods:

Was the ratio of each individual UV exposure and ambient UV exposure in the same days?
There is only half brackets in line 153.

Discussions:

How do you explain the results that the urban boys had the longest outdoor activity time but the minimum personal UV exposure dose among the urban population.

The sentence of 'While an individual may have a high UVR exposure, if they are fully covered with clothing then their skin exposure to UVR will be minimal.' In line 322-324 is confused. Please rewrite it.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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