**RE: manuscript revision and resubmission for IJERPH-1971752**

Dear Editors,

This letter accompanies the resubmission of the manuscript that had been rejected for the special issue on “Occupational Health Risk Assessment”. After accounting for the comments by the Reviewers and the Editors, the authors attach the revised manuscript along with the replies to the feedback.

The revised manuscript is entitled “Commonly-used subjective effort scales may not predict directly-measured physical workloads and fatigue in Hispanic farmworkers”.

Please find our replies to the Editors as follows:

Since we conducted a convenient sample, we removed the phrases that *“The number of participants were determined to yield statistical powers and data saturation among this population”* And that *“Notwithstanding, it is worth remarking that the reason might be due to the fact that the stratification reduced the sample size and, consequently, there was not enough power to detect a significant correlation in each group”.*

We initially assumed that the readers would already know the Borg scales and we had not needed to explicitly explain the scale. Also, the full explanations and examples were already illustrated in the previous paper as cited. Per your comments, we added the description of the Borg scales, both Borg RPE and Borg CR10 in the methodology section that *“Borg RPE and Omni RPE scales were used as subjective measures of overall effort exerted by the workers, and Borg CR10 scale was used as a subjective measure of local discomfort, particularly the tiredness (cansado in Spanish) they felt at the moment. Borg RPE scale, ranged from 6 to 20, was accompanied by verbal anchors from “no exertion” at 6 to “maximal exertion” at 20. Borg CR10 was also accompanied by verbal anchors from “not tired” at 0 to “severely tired” at 10.”*

Per your comments on wordings, we revised the phrase from *“As shown in Figure 4, relative to the Borg RPE ratings collected at the beginning of the work break (T1), there were no difference between the ratings collected at the beginning of the work shift (T1) and after 30 minutes of rest (T2).”* To *“**As shown in Figure 4, relative to the Borg RPE ratings collected at the beginning of the work break (T0), there were no difference between the ratings collected at the beginning of the first break (T1) and after 30 minutes of rest (T2).”*

Also, the phrase *“The Omni RPE from the beginning of the work shift were also greater at the end of the work shift (T3) as compared to the other time”* were revised to *“The difference in Omni RPE from the beginning …”*

Moreover, we changed the conjunction for the two sentences *“Without adjusting for neither work period (T1, T2 and T3) nor harvesting method (Ground, Ladder and Platform), the correlation coefficient between the % HRR and the Borg RPE was insignificant (p-value = 0.23). Similarly, the correlation coefficient between the % HRR and the Omni RPE was positive (p-value = 0.006).”* from “similarly” to “in contrast”.

In the discussion, we changed the interpretation which you mentioned as making no sense *“There were negative significant correlations between the direct and subjective measures of overall effort when the analysis adjusted for the harvesting method and the time of measurement. That is, both Borg RPE and Omni RPE may be used to predict the outcomes of % HRR.*” The new paragraph is written as *“This study found significant correlations between the direct and subjective measures of overall effort when the analysis adjusted for the harvesting method and the time of measurement; however, the directions of corrections were contradictory for Borg RPE and Omni RPE. The negative correlations between Borg RPE and % HRR suggested that the Borg RPE may not be useful as subjective measures for this population whereas the positive correlations between Omni RPE and % HRR suggested that the Omni RPE could predict the outcomes of % HRR*.”

For another sentence that were incorrect “*Field ergonomic assessment can be directly-measured with sensors and subjectively participant’s self-reported ratings*”, we revised that “*Field ergonomic assessment can be conducted by direct measurement with sensors and by questionnaires of subjective self-reported ratings*”.

We also corrected the grammar from “while the Borg scales has a verbal description …” to “… scales have …”

We hope that the quality of this revision will satisfy the requirements of the journal.

Best regards,

Ornwipa Thamsuwan