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Title: Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity: A Critical Review of Explanatory Hypotheses

Submitted work evaluates a very important issue that is called electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS). As a result of modern life, invented new devices in each decades that might affect our body as well as organisms around us. The author widely reviewed literatures that cover the subject. The methodology of selection of papers/reports is acceptable and was done by unbiased manner. Hypotheses on the subject (ESH) were clearly given but some explanation should be given an extended version, since some of ideas would not be understood easily.

The main problems for the human studies about EHS as well as other domains are a low number of subjects, lack of highly trusted quantitative methods and no clear delineation of searched subject. This issue was expressed in the review. Scarcity of experimental studies on the human because of ethical issues and expensive lead researchers to do their works based on qualitative approaches; this is a serious limitation of EHS studies. At this point we can shift to animals studies to make biological comments to see negative/positive effects of electromagnetic fields (EMF). On the other hand, the author searched concerning related topics by means of the appropriate databases and also systematic reviews and expert reports were also used when possible.

The philosophy of author would not be seen clearly, the whole manuscript should be revised by a native speaker or language-editing expert for the sake of readers' times I mean that its language needs polishing.

The subject of this manuscript was reviewed in the available sources and hypotheses on the subject was classified in three main categories: (1) the electromagnetic hypothesis, attributing EHS to EMF exposure; (2) the cognitive hypothesis, assuming that EHS results from false beliefs in EMF harmfulness, promoting nocebo responses to perceived EMF exposure; (3) the attributive hypothesis, conceiving EHS as a coping strategy for pre-existing conditions. All hypotheses were successively evaluated, based on their strength and weak sides.

This is a review article; there are no results (data) that drown back from any sources, for this reason the title "Results" would be deleted from the Abstract.

References were not written according to the journal guide. Some journal name was given as an abbreviation but other full name. Some examples are given in below.
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