Reviewer’s report

Title: Change of urine fluoride and bone metabolism indicators in the endemic fluorosis areas of southern China after supplying low fluorite public water

Version: 1 Date: 26 October 2012

Reviewer: Gopalan Viswanathan

Reviewer’s report:

I am herewith noted some points in the manuscript need to clarify by the authors before the acceptance.

Comment 1
Title of the paper is not clear. Kindly modify the title understandable. Normally the urine fluoride is termed as urinary fluoride. Hence try to use the term urinary fluoride instead of urine fluoride.

Comment 2
Kindly modify the standard curve regression equations and other equations; those are not clear in the materials and method and result sections. Kindly use right equations writing tool for writing equations. Do not try to copy and paste of any equations and figures derived from other computer programs. Consider the font size throughout the manuscript.

Comment 3
Authors mentioned in methodology that the selected children for this study are aged between 6 to 12 years old were randomly chosen from local schools in each village for the study, but in the result section of page 8, it is mentioned that the four intervention villages received low-fluoride public drinking water over a period of 6-17 years. Hence it would not be possible to give any differences between the biochemical parameters between the children in control village and other study areas where the low fluoride drinking water supply. As all children in control and other areas are exposed to nearly equal level of fluoride through drinking water from birth, then how could it give the differences in bone metabolism?

Comment 4
Kindly refer some the following articles to improve the manuscript quality.
2. Maguire A, Zohouri FV, Mathers JC, Steen IN, Hind m arch PN, Moynihan PJ (2005)


Comment 5

Kindly ask the authors to review thoroughly the cases of spelling/grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. This paper makes a significant contribution to the field of environmental health and monitoring. The experimental methodologies are appropriate, and for the most part, the literature review is adequate. For these reasons, the paper merits publication; however, the manuscript is very poorly written and needs careful attention to revise the article free from errors. Discussion and conclusion sections are well written and the article has scientific importance. Hence I recommended the article for publication with minor revision.

Thanking you

Yours sincerely,

G. Viswanathan

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests