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Reviewer’s report:

Though the risk assessment for exposure to atmospheric pollution is not a new issue, the biological pathways investigated and the pollutant considered (ozone) made the article of particular interest and surely suitable for publication. The paper is very well written and only some minor details are to be precisied to better explain the study design.

Minor points:

Background

Line 110: You wrote "…their ambient environment…", but environmental ozone is measured during hospital visits, it is not referred to subjects ambient environment. If you use "their" maybe it could be misunderstood.

Lines 113-114: "The results provide…": it is not the right place to describe results.

Methods

Study population and design

Line 118: It should be better to precise where the Duke University is located (i.e. North Carolina US).

Line 122: The phase of recruitment should be better explained. For example, how many subjects received invitation? What kind of advertisement did you use? This is mentioned only in results, lines 248-249.

More in general, could you justify the reasons for all the selecting conditions?

Lines 141-143: could you please provide some more details about the season in which the visits on participants were done? They were distributed during the two-years period (May 2012 - April 2014) or concentrated in some season? Since you studied exposure to ozone, seasonality is an important point to consider.
Clinical measurements

Line 214: The acronym QT seems not defined in the list of abbreviations, where QTc refers to QT.

Air pollution and meteorological measurements

Lines 221-224: The choice of the measurement station has to be better explained. Why did you use a 44 km distant station while the one located only 18 km far has been used only for missing data?

Results

Lines 246-247: You established to exclude two subjects because they completed less than three study sessions, was it an a priori condition?

Lines 255-257: The total of 117 exposure days analyzed doesn't fit with the sum of all the visits you described in detail before. Did some subjects had a visit in the same day?
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