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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We are writing to resubmit our manuscript entitled, “City Health Outlook (CHO): Protocol for A Human Health and Air Pollution Study”.

We have carefully reviewed reviewer’s comments and addressed each of them. The major revisions include:

1. Make the revision conform to the journal style. All references have been checked and numbered. The English proficiency has been checked by a native English speaker.

2. Add one paragraph in the “Limitation” sub-session, discussing the limitation in low-cost sensor accuracy.
Detailed revision to Editor Comments:

- Please ensure your manuscript is formatted in line with our submission guidelines, for example reference style (numbered list).

  Response: The reference style has been changed to numbered list.

- Please ensure the abstract in the submission system is identical to that in the pdf.

  Response: Done.

- Please move the abbreviation list outside the declarations section

  Response: Done.

- Please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in your manuscript. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure

  Response: The informed consent was in written. It has been clarified in the revision.

- In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

  Response: The role has been added.

- Can you please provide the source of the Map used in figure 3?

  Response: The data source has been added.
Response to Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 1:

Lines 131-134:

I am concerned that the performance of the TE-STR is quite poor compared with the TSI (poor correlations). I think this should at the very least be commented on in the text here and also as part of the limitations as it will impact on the quality of the findings.

Response: We appreciate this suggestion and added a paragraph (Line 425-434) discussing the limitation on low-cost sensors.

Minor

Line 29: Apologies - correction should have been "albeit with high".

Response: Corrected.

Line 93: New "begins with an introduction of the CHO"

Response: Corrected.

Reviewer 2:

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Please make sure to revise for English proficiency, and that any response made to the reviewer is also explained within the text of the manuscript (as it should be made clear also for any reader).

Response: The revision was sent to a native English speaker for English proficiency checking. The language quality was improved.

We deeply appreciate the opportunity to revise our manuscript and are confident that the quality of this work has been improved to meet the standards of BMC Public Health. We look forward to receiving decisions or feedbacks from the reviewers. If you have any queries, please don't hesitate to contact me.