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General comments:
The paper is much improved. Some issues should be still better addressed

Minor essentials Revisions

Methods:

Questionnaire and Data collection:
The criteria for the classification of the working ambient is still not clear: what is the difference between “good” and “satisfactory”? The Authors say that there was a visual observation and then workplace conditions were ranked. So there was a kind of list or requirements? Who did the inspections? A physician? The workers themselves? Always the same person?

Analytical procedure: Please specify 1) the method used to calculate the analytical limit of detection, 2) the concentration of the standard used for quantifying unknown samples

Results:

Smoking habit results are completely lacking. As smoking is widely discussed in the paper, the number of smokers and of passive smokers must be given here. I suggest adding this information in Table 1 and discussing differences, if any, in smokers distribution among groups.

Tables and Figures:

Table 4: Why is mean instead of median reported for these data? The number of subjects is lacking, as well the number of detected/undetected samples. Numbers of smokers must be given. To present data, please use the same format used in Table 3.
Minor issues not for publication:
Please read carefully the paper for spelling mistakes still present. I just list some of them:
Naphthalene is called NAPH or NPTH.
In Introduction: the sentence “Low molecular weight PAHs....” should be “Among low molecular weight...”
In Statistical analysis: “to examine the relationships blood contamination” should be “to examine the relationships between blood contamination”
In Results, 4th paragraph: “showed significantly high NAPH levels among...” should be “showed significantly higher NAPH levels among...”
And so on
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