PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Protocol for a systematic review on systemic and skin toxicity of important hazardous hair and nail cosmetic ingredients in hairdressers
AUTHORS	Uter, Wolfgang; Johansen, J; Havmose, Martin Stibius; Kezic, Sanja; van der Molen, Henk; Macan, Jelena; Babić, Željka; Turk, Rajka; Symanzik, Cara; John, Swen

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dorothy Holness St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Occupational Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	09-May-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a well written paper. One of its key strengths is the
	examination of not just skin effects, but also respiratory and CMR
	effects. The methodology is clearly outlined and appropriate.

REVIEWER	Olufunmilayo Olusegun
	University of KwaZulu-Natal
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Jul-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	July 8, 2021
CENERAE COMMENTO	
	The Managing Editor,
	BMJ Open
	Dear Dr. Andy McLarnon,
	Thanks for the opportunity to review the manuscript titled "Protocol
	for a systematic review on skin and systemic toxicity of important
	hazardous substances in hair cosmetics and hand eczema in
	hairdressers". The protocol is informative and precise; however, the
	following minor revisions are recommended.
	Reviewers' comments
	1. Kindly clarify the reason for indicating that only accepted
	publications newer than 1999 can be considered.
	2. In the Appendix A section, kindly check the chemical names and
	rewrite correctly. For example, p-Phenylenediamine should be
	written as p-Phenylenediamine (p in italics). Please apply for all
	related chemical compounds. In addition, please double check the
	names of the organic compounds and write appropriately.
	The manuscript is recommended for publication after revision.
	Thank you.
	Thank you.
	Manual and the
	Yours sincerely,
	Olufunmilayo Olusegun, PhD

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author:

This is a well written paper. One of its key strengths is the examination of not just skin effects, but also respiratory and CMR effects. The methodology is clearly outlined and appropriate. -> Thank you!

Reviewer: 2

Reviewers' comments

1. Kindly clarify the reason for indicating that only accepted publications newer than 1999 can be considered.

-> we have added an explanation why we prefer to include only more current studies in the systematic review. Mostly this decision was made to have study results reflect current exposure to hair/nail cosmetics, and not so much historical exposure, which was partly much higher. However, older consolidated results are also considered by referring to reviews (sensu lato) in the discussion of results, such as the opinions of SCCS and predecessors and German MAK Commission.

2. In the Appendix A section, kindly check the chemical names and rewrite correctly. For example, p-Phenylenediamine should be written as p-Phenylenediamine (p in italics). Please apply for all related chemical compounds. In addition, please double check the names of the organic compounds and write appropriately.

-> thank you for spotting nomenclature problems, which we hope are now all resolved.

The manuscript is recommended for publication after revision. -> Thank you.