



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_15164
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Health Hazards of the Goldsmiths in Tantibazar Area of Dhaka, Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Revision is still necessary, because the data has not been given and discussion is misleading.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 59-61: Be specific--- this article is not related to environmental health hazard rather it is related to occupation. How you have determined level and extent of the exposure? Line 70-73: Concentrate on working environment not general environment. It would be better to delete these sentences from here and add those to the concluding part. Line 78--: use past sentences Line 96-98: How you have determined the minimum number of FGD respondents because it needs statistical sampling, purposive random has no meaning, it should be either purposive or random (it needs again statistical sampling). Define the middleman group, what they actually do? Are they exposed to similar health hazards as of goldsmiths? Otherwise why they have been included? Line 110: last sentence should be deleted. Table 2 & 3 does not represent the array od data rather some tick marks only, data means how many individuals reported that ailment(s), for which you have presented bar and pie chart (what is basis of those graph?) Discussion is still misleading—what you have obtained from your study and how far it corroborates with other studies. 	<p>Thanks for your comments. We have tried to address your comments as follow-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The term Environmental Health has been changed to Occupational Health. The extent of their exposure has been determined by interpreting the responses of FGD, i.e. from the total population working in a unit (fig. 3) and the unit-wise exposure to health risks (table 2 & table 3). Addressed. Addressed. It was a purposive sampling. We were unable to do statistical sampling because of time and resource limitation. Explanations have been given from line 97 to 102. Addressed in the lines from 544 to 549, and 97. Addressed. Table 2 & 3 have been developed to represent the FGD responses on the goldsmiths' exposures to different occupational health risks depending on the type of unit they work in. The tables also help to justify figure 4 & 5. Addressed in section 3.4 from the line 328 to 374. Besides, necessary corrections have been made all over the manuscript.