

Author's response to reviews

Title: Applicability of non-invasively collected matrices for human biomonitoring

Authors:

Roel Smolders (roel.smolders@vito.be)

Karl-Werner Schramm (schramm@helmholtz-muenchen.de)

Marc Nickmilder (marc.nickmilder@toxi.ucl.ac.be)

Greet Schoeters (greet.schoeters@vito.be)

Version: 3 **Date:** 18 November 2008

Author's response to reviews: see over

Cover letter

Title publication: A review on the applicability of non-invasively collected matrices for human biomonitoring

MS: 1887340323220391

Authors: Smolders Roel, Schramm Karl-Werner, Nickmilder Marc, Schoeters Greet

Reviewer: Sue Fenton

No comments were made

Reviewer: Gerald Moy

No comments were made

Reviewer: Antonio Mutti

We have as much as possible tried to edit the paper, and limit the length of the sentences.

We hope this will improve the quality of the paper.

Additionally, the reviewer made comments and remarks in the text, which we have tried to follow as much as possible. However, in a number of occasions, we whose not to do this:

- Page 9: hippuric acid may not be used in occupational exposure anymore, but it still may have its merits for environmental exposure scenarios. The reference referred to is from 2007, so not outdated. There are a lot of other relevant publications, including very recent ones (e.g. Ikeda et al, Toxicology Letters, Volume 181, Sept 2008)
- Page 10: we consider a biomarker fully validated if “reference materials and internationally recognised standard methodologies are often available, and sampling procedures are well-documented”. There is a lot of discussion, also within the INTARESE project, on the issue when a biomarker can be considered “fully validated”, but the availability of reference materials, internationally accepted SOPs and sampling procedures certainly are from our perspective key requisites

- Page 22: It is true that sampling standardization is an issue in EBC, but it is outside of the scope of this publication to tackle this
- Page 24: Although I agree with the reviewer, we have found no papers in the peer-reviewed scientific literature using loss of hair as a biomarker of effect

All other comments were appreciated and changes were made in the text to reflect them.