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Reviewer's report:

Revision for Environmental Health

Article: minor essential revisions'

1. Is the question posed original, important and well defined?

The topic in the manuscript is adequate and understandable for public, further it is original research for environmental contamination and consequences over public health. With the reading of researcher, the public has some possibilities

2. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The data are adequate with objectives due specific the judgments about to evaluate the ills over population affected by petroleum contamination, but there some questions with children. They are susceptible to develop many ills about environmental contamination.

3. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the data?

The interpretation of data are validate with considerations about sampling group further the statistics employ in this research are according with suppositions of authors. The manuscript lacks of references that support their reasoning.

4. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to allow others to evaluate and/or replicate the work?

With suppositions are fit to reproducible again although there some questions about susceptibility among women and men for this study. If possible to make correlation analyses with the results with intention of possible associations with the evaluated variable.

5. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods?

Please comment on any improvements that could be made to the study design to enhance the quality of the results. If any additional experiments are required, please give details.

If novel experimental techniques were used please pay special attention to their
reliability and validity.

6. Can the writing, organization, tables and figures be improved?

The English in general is correct but the organization of sections did not clear among discussion, conclusion and references for better consistency and clarity.

7. Although the editorial team may also assess the quality of the written English, please do comment if you consider the standard is below that expected for a scientific publication.

If the manuscript is organized in such a manner that it is illogical or not easily accessible to the reader please suggest improvements.

Please provide feedback on whether the data are presented in the most appropriate manner; for example, is a table being used where a graph would give increased clarity? Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation, and of a high enough quality to be published in their present form?

8. When revisions are requested.

Only need some explanations in discussion and conclusions of results further the possible analysis in other groups of population for this pollution area.

9. Are there any ethical or competing interests issues you would like to raise?

The manuscript shows an approval of data among authors without conflict interest at respect of topic.

10. Reviewers are reminded of the importance of timely reviews.

No

11. Confidentiality

In this aspect, it is clear that review is a confidential document.

12. Are the included additional files (supplementary materials) appropriate?

No, but the data shows are sufficient for this manuscript. Only be clear in the support with UN report.