

Author's response to reviews

Title: Health conditions and occupational risks in a novel group: waste pickers in the largest open garbage dump in Latin America

Authors:

Vanessa Cruvinel (vanessarcruvinel@gmail.com)

Carla Marques (carlapintas@uol.com.br)

Vanessa Cardoso (vanessacardosoescs@gmail.com)

Maria Novaes (ritanovaes2@gmail.com)

Wildo Araújo (wildo74@gmail.com)

Antonia Angulo-Tuesta (antoniaangulo@unb.br)

Patrícia Escalda (patescalda@yahoo.com.br)

Dayani Galato (dayani.galato@gmail.com)

Petruza Brito (petruzabrito@gmail.com)

Everton Nunes da Silva (evertonsilva@unb.br)

Version: 2 Date: 02 Apr 2019

Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We thank you for the opportunity to have our manuscript Number: PUBH-D-18-03422 entitled "A study protocol for assessing health conditions and occupational risks in a novel group: waste pickers in the largest open garbage dump in Latin America" evaluated for publication by BMC Public Health. The reviewer comments were very valuable to improve the manuscript. For all the comments, we are happy to implement the suggestions to improve the manuscript, as described below.

Yours sincerely,

The Authors

Reviewer Comments

General Comments: The authors have incorporated majority of the suggestions by the reviewer but some anomalies were still observed which needs to be rectified before the manuscript can be finalized for acceptance. The queries are as follows:

Comment 1. Page 1, In the Discussion section of Abstract, as a response to the initial query, the author's mention that 'The majority was xx% gender.... Please mention the value of x in the manuscript.

Our response: The percentage value was included in the abstract section of the manuscript (line 32).

Comment 2. Page 1, In the Discussion section of Abstract, the author's mention that about 27% of the surveyed population did not attend school, which means a large proportion (73%), had some prior education. In such a case the author would need to present a discussion as to why inspite of having such basic degree of education, the workers had chosen such a way of earning their livelihood?

Our response: In total, 27.3% of the participants did not attend to any school and 47.7% were educated only up to primary level so, 75.0% of the sample had low education. This explanation is mentioned in lines 520-524, page 21.

Comment 3. Your references are mix of both number system and alphabetical order in the manuscript. For example, in page 3 – you mention different references in number format but also the name of the author format. For example Chokhandre et al 2017; Jayakrishnan et al., 2013. Please follow the appropriate reference format of the journal.

Our response: The respective references were changed to numbers (lines 73 and 77, page 2)

Comment 4. Page 9, The authors mention that the district produces 1,0 kg per capita per day. It is not clear whether the author means 1.0 or any other numerical notation for kg per capita per day.

Our response: The sentence was corrected: 1.0 kg (equivalent 2.20 lb) per capita per day (line 236, page 9)